

# For Reference

---

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

# For Reference

---

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS  
UNIVERSITATIS  
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Rappel1965>









7200-10  
1965/66  
# 18

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TYPE OF SUCCESSOR TO THE  
PRINCIPALSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE IN SCHOOLS

by

LAWRENCE EDWARD RAPPEL

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

JUNE, 1965





UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Relationship Between the Type of Successor to the Principalship and Organizational Change in Schools," submitted by Lawrence Edward Rappel in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.



## ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between the type of successor to the principalship and organizational change in schools. Theory and research on organizational changes indicate that institutions, like schools, are oriented towards maintaining stability within organizations. Stability is maintained by group indoctrination of norms and values and by a process of feed-back. Changes upset this stability and result in some degree of tension and conflict within the organization. Change, then, is slow and minor in nature. Although various forces can account for changes in organizations, this study concentrated on studying how leaders, such as principals, are able to institute changes.

Both theory and empirical research indicate that leaders appointed from outside the organization are more likely to introduce changes than leaders appointed from inside the organization. Factors accounting for this situation are: (1) the outsider lacks any previous psychological and sociological orientation, (2) he lacks loyalty to the organization, (3) he is unaware of the feed-back processes maintaining stability, and (4) he engenders a greater flux of social forces when appointed.

Following this theoretical distinction between outside and inside successors this study compared two types of principal successors. Outsiders were principals who had no experience within the school. Insiders were principals who had some previous experience within the school.

These two successors were compared in two ways. First, the teachers' perceptions of change were compared. Second, the teachers'



reactions to changes instituted by both types of successors were compared. The teachers' responses were gathered by sending out questionnaires to all schools which had a new principal in 1962-63 and 1963-64. On this questionnaire the teachers were asked to describe, in a dichotomous manner, changes instituted by the new principal and their satisfaction with these changes. The sample included 452 teachers and 104 principals. Both categories of principals and teachers were quite similar with respect to age, training and previous teaching and administrative experience.

Significant differences were found between outside and inside successors. Teachers in schools of outside successors reported more changes than teachers in schools of inside successors. However, the teachers reported more changes in areas of school organization that involved student activities and not in areas where teachers were affected more directly.

Teachers in both categories of schools also reacted differently to implemented changes. More teachers in schools of outsiders were dissatisfied with instituted changes rather than a maintenance of the status quo. In schools of insiders, however, more teachers were dissatisfied with the status quo. Changes in the informal organization were disliked by both groups of teachers more than changes in the formal organization. In general, the insiders engendered less dissatisfaction with their balance of change and lack of change.

Although there were comparative differences between the two types of successors, the teachers in both categories of schools perceived changes much less frequently than lack of changes.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank all principals and teachers who participated in the study. A special expression of thanks is extended to Dr. J. H. M. Andrews, the advisor for this study, for his invaluable assistance during the preparation of the study. Thanks are also expressed to Dr. E. Miklos and Dr. J. O. Fritz, the other committee members. The writer, finally, wishes to express his appreciation to his wife and friends who helped him at various stages in the study.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER                                                        | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                      | 1    |
| Stability and Change in Organizations . . . . .                | 1    |
| Conditions Facilitating Change . . . . .                       | 3    |
| II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND . . . . .                           | 7    |
| Stability and Change in Organizations . . . . .                | 7    |
| Stability of Social Organizations . . . . .                    | 7    |
| Change in Social Organizations . . . . .                       | 9    |
| Stability and Change in Bureaucratic Organizations . . . . .   | 11   |
| Principal Succession and Organizational Change . . . . .       | 15   |
| Leadership Succession in Social Organizations . . . . .        | 15   |
| Psychological Constraints Upon Principals . . . . .            | 17   |
| Sociological Constraints--Heritage of Loyalty . . . . .        | 19   |
| Heritage of Social Relationships . . . . .                     | 22   |
| Knowledge of Feed-Back . . . . .                               | 24   |
| Expectations . . . . .                                         | 26   |
| The Consequences of Changes Instituted by Successors . . . . . | 28   |
| Summary of the Chapter . . . . .                               | 30   |
| III. THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF RESEARCH . . . . .              | 33   |
| The Problem . . . . .                                          | 33   |
| Statement of the Problem . . . . .                             | 33   |
| Sub-Problems . . . . .                                         | 33   |
| Hypotheses . . . . .                                           | 33   |



| CHAPTER                                                                                       | PAGE |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Significance of the Study . . . . .                                                           | 37   |
| Assumptions . . . . .                                                                         | 39   |
| Delimitations of the Study . . . . .                                                          | 40   |
| Limitations of the Study . . . . .                                                            | 41   |
| Definition of Terms . . . . .                                                                 | 41   |
| Change . . . . .                                                                              | 41   |
| Formal Organization . . . . .                                                                 | 42   |
| Informal Organization . . . . .                                                               | 42   |
| Inside Successor . . . . .                                                                    | 42   |
| Outside Successor . . . . .                                                                   | 42   |
| Principal . . . . .                                                                           | 42   |
| The Research Design . . . . .                                                                 | 43   |
| The Sample . . . . .                                                                          | 43   |
| Nature of the Instrument . . . . .                                                            | 44   |
| Method of Collecting the Data . . . . .                                                       | 45   |
| Analyzing the Data . . . . .                                                                  | 46   |
| Dividing the Responses . . . . .                                                              | 46   |
| Testing the Hypotheses . . . . .                                                              | 47   |
| IV. RESULTS . . . . .                                                                         | 50   |
| Nature of the Sample . . . . .                                                                | 50   |
| Description of the Principals . . . . .                                                       | 50   |
| Description of the Teachers . . . . .                                                         | 50   |
| Comparison of Outside and Inside Successors on Instituting<br>Organizational Change . . . . . | 52   |



## CHAPTER

## PAGE

|                                                                                                                                            |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Findings--Test of Hypothesis One . . . . .                                                                                                 | 52 |
| Nature of Differences in Changes Instituted . . . . .                                                                                      | 52 |
| Summary of Findings . . . . .                                                                                                              | 56 |
| Discussion of Findings . . . . .                                                                                                           | 56 |
| A Comparison of Outsiders With No Experience and Some<br>Experience in the School System on Instituting<br>Organizational Change . . . . . | 58 |
| Findings--Test of Hypothesis Two . . . . .                                                                                                 | 58 |
| Nature of Differences in Changes Instituted . . . . .                                                                                      | 58 |
| Summary . . . . .                                                                                                                          | 59 |
| Discussion . . . . .                                                                                                                       | 62 |
| The Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes in Schools of<br>Inside Successors . . . . .                                                       | 63 |
| Findings--Test of Hypothesis Three . . . . .                                                                                               | 63 |
| Nature of Differences in Satisfaction of Change . . . . .                                                                                  | 64 |
| Summary of Findings . . . . .                                                                                                              | 66 |
| The Teachers' Satisfaction with Change in Schools of<br>Outside Successors . . . . .                                                       | 67 |
| Findings--Test of Hypothesis Four . . . . .                                                                                                | 67 |
| Nature of Differences in Satisfaction of Change . . . . .                                                                                  | 68 |
| Summary of Findings . . . . .                                                                                                              | 71 |
| Discussion of the Findings Derived from Hypotheses<br>Three and Four . . . . .                                                             | 72 |
| Comparison of Inside and Outside Successors on Instituting<br>Organizational Rules . . . . .                                               | 75 |





| CHAPTER                                                   | PAGE |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Findings--Testing Hypothesis Five . . . . .               | 75   |
| Comparison of the Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes in  |      |
| Organizational Rules in Both Categories of Schools . . .  | 77   |
| Findings--Testing Hypothesis Six . . . . .                | 77   |
| The Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes in Organizational |      |
| Rules in Schools of Outside Successors . . . . .          | 77   |
| Findings . . . . .                                        | 77   |
| Discussion . . . . .                                      | 79   |
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .     | 81   |
| Summary of the Problem and Research Design . . . . .      | 81   |
| The Problem . . . . .                                     | 81   |
| Hypotheses . . . . .                                      | 81   |
| Sample . . . . .                                          | 82   |
| Instrumentation . . . . .                                 | 82   |
| Method of Collecting and Analyzing the Data . . . . .     | 83   |
| Results . . . . .                                         | 84   |
| Hypothesis One . . . . .                                  | 84   |
| Hypothesis Two . . . . .                                  | 84   |
| Hypothesis Three . . . . .                                | 85   |
| Hypothesis Four . . . . .                                 | 86   |
| Hypothesis Five . . . . .                                 | 86   |
| Hypothesis Six . . . . .                                  | 86   |
| Conclusions . . . . .                                     | 87   |
| Implications . . . . .                                    | 88   |



| CHAPTER                                        | PAGE |
|------------------------------------------------|------|
| Recommendations for Further Research . . . . . | 91   |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                         | 93   |
| APPENDIX A Supplementary Tables . . . . .      | 96   |
| APPENDIX B The Questionnaire . . . . .         | 105  |



## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE |                                                                                                                              | PAGE |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I.    | General Description of Inside and Outside Successors . . . .                                                                 | 51   |
| II.   | General Description of Teachers in Both Categories<br>of Principals . . . . .                                                | 51   |
| III.  | Comparison of Outsiders and Insiders on Instituting<br>Organizational Change , . . . .                                       | 53   |
| IV.   | Itemized Differences between Outside and Inside<br>Successors on Instituting Organizational Change . . . . .                 | 54   |
| V.    | Relationship of Previous Experience in A School System<br>To the Extent of Changes Instituted by Outside Successors.         | 59   |
| VI.   | Relationship of Previous Experience in a School System to<br>The Nature of Changes Instituted by Outside Successors . .      | 60   |
| VII.  | A Comparison of the Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes and<br>Lack of Changes in Schools of Inside Successors . . . . .     | 63   |
| VIII. | Itemized Differences Between the Teachers' Satisfaction with<br>Change and Lack of Change in Schools of Inside Successors    | 65   |
| IX.   | A Comparison of the Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes and<br>Lack of Changes in Schools of Outside Successors . . . . .    | 68   |
| X.    | Itemized Differences Between the Teachers' Satisfaction with<br>Changes and Lack of Changes in Schools of Outside Successors | 69   |
| XI.   | Differences Between Outside and Inside Successors on Insti-<br>tuting Changes in Rules . . . . .                             | 76   |



## TABLE

## PAGE

|        |                                                                                                                                                |     |
|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| XII.   | A Comparison of Changes in Rules Teachers Are Expected<br>To Follow with Changes in Number of Teachers Actually<br>Following Rules . . . . .   | 77  |
| XIII.  | Relationship Between the Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes<br>In Rules and the Type of Principal Successor . . . . .                         | 78  |
| XIV.   | A Comparison of the Teachers' Satisfaction with Changes and<br>Lack of Changes in Rules in Schools of Outside Successors . . . . .             | 78  |
| XV.    | Results of Responses on Organizational Change for Both<br>Categories of Successors . . . . .                                                   | 97  |
| XVI.   | Results of Responses on Desirability of Change and No Change<br>In Schools of Inside Successors . . . . .                                      | 99  |
| XVII.  | Results of Responses on Desirability of Change and No Change<br>in Schools of Outside Successors . . . . .                                     | 101 |
| XVIII. | Results of Responses on Organizational Change for Outside<br>Successors with No and Some Previous Experience in the<br>School System . . . . . | 103 |





## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Stability and Change in Organizations

A major characteristic of well-established organizations is their predominate tendency to stabilize their main functional and organizational features. This tendency towards stability is encouraged by the personnel in an organization for several good reasons. First, organizations need a defined area of consensus in their main purposes and organizational features. Second, organizations need a certain degree of group solidarity, cohesiveness and morale in order to satisfy the psychological wants of the individual members. In an organization where there is no definite group feeling and where there is no definition of purpose and structure there may be a feeling of insecurity on the part of the personnel. Lack of consensus and solidarity in an organization also results in a confusion of roles and status for the members in the organization and in a disorderly functioning of tasks and communications. The general effect is that the members lower their commitment towards the organizational purposes and, thus, the organization becomes less effective in terms of productivity towards society in general. In summary, stability in an organization fosters the security of the members, enhances the group solidarity and morale, and facilitates the efficient organization of tasks and communications.

Organizations, however, must also be adaptive. Although large and



frequent changes are discouraged because they tend to threaten the basic stability of an organization, most well-established organizations accept and need minor, but well-spaced changes. Changes usually originate from two sources. Within the organization, the boredom or insecurity of the personnel or the need to solve certain organizational problems may cause changes. Pressures from outside the organization may also force changes upon an organization. Few social organizations exist independently of their external environment. Changes in the larger social milieu often force smaller, dependent organizations to adapt to these changes. These changes need not be very radical and they need not occur too frequently in order for smaller organizations to survive in the larger external environment. These changes also need not be progressive in the sense that they are an acceptance of the changing norms outside the organization. Business organizations which suffer losses because of competition from other organizations are examples of organizations which usually adapt policies and procedures in a progressive fashion. However, some social groups like the Amish folk of Pennsylvania react to the threats of different ideas and customs from the external environment by stabilizing and strengthening traditional norms. Change still occurs, but in a reactionary way.

The rate of changes in an organization also varies with the type of organization. Large, well-established public institutions like the church or school do not change very quickly. Basically, change is slow because too many different kinds of people have to become reconciled to the changes and also because the external threats to survival are less





than in smaller, more private organizations. Business organizations which depend upon one major goal--that of making profits, and small social organizations which do not have formal and traditional norms, are examples of organizations which may change more rapidly.

Schools are public institutions which have some degree of central government control. Schools are also a monopoly in that they have no serious competitors. Schools, too, rely on public norms and values and usually change in response to some general change in the social milieu. Because of these conditions schools are usually quite stable and rather slow to introduce major changes.

#### Conditions Facilitating Change

Although school organizations and schools, themselves, are fairly stable there are certain conditions under which changes can occur. The conditions are relevant to the nature of the organization and also to the psychological and sociological conditions within the organization. Many factors can aid the change process. Blau mentions factors such as the cohesiveness of the group, the similarity of the leader's goals with the group's goals, the degree to which the group members have become professionally minded and the leader's perception of his role.<sup>1</sup> These conditions are basically internal in nature. Impressed by the conservative and stable nature of schools this study looked, rather, at external forces causing change.

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter M. Blau, Dynamics of Bureaucracy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 201-214.



The main purpose of this study was to isolate one set of external conditions that might cause changes. This condition was the appointment of a new principal to the school. A new principal may represent external or internal forces upon the school. The principal who has had some previous experience in the school would be classed as an internal force or an insider. Unlike the insider, the principal who has had no previous experience in the school would be classed as an external force, or an outsider. In comparing two types of superintendents who were insiders and outsiders, Carlson concluded that superintendents appointed from outside the system to the superintendent's position tended to be innovators while insiders tended to stabilize the system 'as is.'<sup>2</sup>

In his analysis of insiders and outsiders appointed to the superintendent's position, Carlson attributed this difference between the two successors in instituting changes to the psychological and sociological conditions that constrain the new superintendent when making changes. Unlike the insider, the outsider faces a different situation upon becoming a leader. Essentially, he is not committed to the traditional purposes of the organization, knows little about the past practices and methods and has few social connections with personnel in the organization. For these reasons he is able to initiate more changes than the insider.

In a similar manner, these constraints may also be present when principals are appointed to leadership positions in schools. Although

---

<sup>2</sup>Richard O. Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change (Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre, The University of Chicago, 1962), p. 20.





principals are not the chief leaders in a school system they still have some responsibility for the organizational framework within their own schools. There is some theoretical indication that more organizational changes would result from the appointment of an outsider as compared to an insider. However, no empirical studies at the level of the school have demonstrated this relationship.

If the outsiders face a rather different situation than the insiders when becoming principal then the nature of changes might also be different. Because of these differences in the type of changes instituted, and also because of the differences in the situation facing the two types of successors, there may be some differences in how the teachers accept the changes in schools where insiders and outsiders become principals.

Thus, the main problem of this study was to compare two different types of principal successors on the nature and extent of changes instituted by them. A tentative hypothesis was that the outside successors would institute more changes than the inside successors.

Another problem related to the one outlined above was concerned with the extent and nature of changes instituted by two different types of outside successors. These two types were the outsiders who had some previous experience in the school system and the outsiders who had no previous experience in the school system.

A sub-problem of this study was to compare the teachers in schools of outside and inside successors on their reaction to changes instituted by both types of successors. Were the teachers in schools of inside and



outside successors satisfied with the changes instituted by their respective principals? What was the effect of changes in organizational rules upon the teachers in both categories of schools?

In order to state these problems and their related hypotheses in a meaningful way a more detailed analysis of the theoretical framework will be presented in Chapter II. This chapter will attempt to explain why outsiders institute more changes and outline some possible consequences of instituted changes upon teachers in the schools.



## CHAPTER II

### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

#### I. STABILITY AND CHANGE IN ORGANIZATIONS

##### Stability of Social Organizations

Equilibrium in an organization refers to the degree of stability within an organization. This degree of stability is, in turn, related to the degree of consensus and solidarity in the organization.<sup>3</sup> Groups with a large amount of divergence in consensus accepted by group members usually have a small degree of group solidarity and tend to be quite unstable.<sup>4</sup> Equilibrium in an organization can be undermined by a loss in consensus through conflicts over basic goals, policies or methods of organization. Conflicts between personalities and social groups can also undermine the equilibrium of an organization. With a loss of consensus and solidarity social control breaks down and all types of deviations from the group norm are allowed to exist. A loss of social control to the point where co-operation is impossible between conflicting groups seriously endangers the proper functioning of the organization. The organization becomes unable to allocate and integrate functions. Moreover, the efficiency of the organization to contribute to the well-being of the individual members is lessened and the effectiveness of the organization to contribute some social product to the external

---

<sup>3</sup>Peter M. Blau and Richard W. Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962), p. 109.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 111.





environment is reduced.

An example of the effect of the loss of equilibrium in an organization is outlined by McCleery in a case study of the conditions leading to the breakdown of social control in a prison.<sup>5</sup> Here the basic conflict resulted from a difference in the policy by which the guards and custodial staff treated inmates in a prison. Under a former warden the guards of the prison had developed a system of authority to control the inmates. With the death of the warden and the introduction of a new warden there was a change in the formal power structure which gave a liberally-minded custodial staff more control than the guards over policy decisions of the prison. This change in the basic policy of how to treat the inmates forced a redefinition of roles, norms and sanctions for the guards, and also for the older inmates in the prison.

Thus, the conflict between an authoritarian and democratic policy of handling the inmates caused disturbances in the social organization because the guards lost their former power and control over the prisoners, and also because the older inmates lost their former positions of status and informal authority over newer inmates. The loss of social control attending this conflict caused a rebellion which precipitated anarchy and disorganization in the prison. One important factor leading to the disorganization was the breakdown in communication patterns between the old guard and the more liberally-minded custodial staff. In summary, a loss of consensus led to the breakdown in communications and a

---

<sup>5</sup>Richard H. McCleery, "Policy Change in Prison Management," Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, editor (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 376-400.



resultant decrease in solidarity which lessened the social control in the prison. The final result was serious disequilibrium in the organization.

### Change in Social Organizations

When organizations are viewed as systems with structural links between related parts, equilibrium is defined as the capacity of the system to maintain a steady state. However, this steady state is not static, but a dynamic opposition of antagonistic forces which produces a type of controlled tension perceivable as a steady state. These antagonistic forces can be thought of as basically two types of forces--conservative forces which propel the organization in its present course, and liberal forces which desire to change the present organizational course to some alternative route. The opposition of these forces in balance is the steady state of a system. To maintain this steady state the system reacts sensitively to the internal and external environment through a process of feed-back. When changes threaten to pull the conflicting forces within the organization one way or another, the organization reacts to resist this change. Too much change may disturb the steady state and thus upset the equilibrium. Through this process of feed-back the system is able to maintain itself. Responses from the internal and external environment 'tip off' the system to hostile forces from inside or outside the organization which might change the present patterns of organization.

Change in itself is not necessarily hostile to the organization as long as the system can adapt to the change without any fear of serious





imbalance in the equilibrium of the system caused by major changes in the established role structure, norms and sanctions of the organization. Various research studies have indicated that changes are accepted when the leaders and most of the members of a group understand or accept the anticipated consequences of the change. Involving members of organizations in the planning of changes so that they have some part in determining the nature of change also seems to reduce the resistance of individuals and groups to change.

Change is particularly hostile when the controlled tension which keeps the organizational system in a steady state is relaxed or disturbed. This controlled tension can be relaxed by a decrease of social control. That is, reference to group norms and sanctions becomes less effective in controlling the behaviour of group members. This controlled tension can also be disturbed by major changes in norms, by a drastic re-alignment of conservative and liberal forces, and by the inability of the organization to react to its feed-back processes and, thus, minimize group conflicts. Unless the organization is capable of sustaining the stress of disequilibrium or unless the changes anticipated are well known and accepted by group members, the organization is forced to adapt its organizational mechanisms to contain or minimize the threatening forces of change. This adaptation may take the form of group sanctions or some reference to traditional values, habits or customs. Open condemnation or expulsion is avoided because these procedures only result in further deviation, and thus, greater instability. Once a rebel or threatening force becomes established in an



organization then punishment to this group only succeeds in 'opening up' the conflict, causing further rebel deviation and a possibility that the rebel forces will be able to influence other members who are indifferent or even rebellious to the traditional values. Once a degree of threatened change is established, it becomes increasingly difficult for the organization to restore its steady state.

An organization is quite careful about allowing any major deviations from its traditional goals, methods and values. Members of the organization realize this need to maintain a large degree of stability and so emphasize present norms with a certain degree of pride and group righteousness to newcomers. Formal policies and rules are enforced to prevent too much radical, individual action. Newcomers have to fit into present formal and informal role structures. In summary, stability is maintained by the basic structure of an organization and by members in the organization. This drive for stability rather than change seems necessary because of the organization's fear of the more drastic consequences of major changes on its structural equilibrium.

#### Stability and Change in Bureaucratic Organizations

Although bureaucracies rely on small groups within the organization to institute a degree of conformity within the group, they also have other methods for maintaining the stability of the organization. Simon and March have outlined a theory of equilibrium which is basically a theory of motivation.<sup>6</sup> Central to this theory is the analysis

---

<sup>6</sup>James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, "The Theory of Organizational Equilibrium," Complex Organizations, Amitai Etzioni, editor (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 61-71.





of organizations in terms of inducements and contributions. In return for certain inducements (money, prestige, authority), personnel will contribute certain payments (work) to an organization. However, the cost of payments is not only work, but the willing compliance of the worker to function in the manner the organization expects him. He has to listen to supervisors in authority. He has to abide by the decisions of the organization in relation to promotion and placement. Thus, the participant is always considering the margin of inducement rewards as opposed to participant payments. If the pay he receives does not seem adequate compensation for the work he does, or if he feels unrewarded by infrequent promotions, or if he sees that formal rules he has to follow only decrease his personal satisfaction in his work, then he will leave the organization. But all workers do not have the energy, capacity or ability to leave an organization. Thus, they may become indifferent to the goals of the organization or they may become highly critical, dissident members of the organization.

Presthus has classified these two types of reactions to bureaucratic organization as indifferents and ambivalents.<sup>7</sup> Indifferents are workers who cannot identify with organizational norms and conditions, and resign themselves to the situation in which they find themselves. They search for meaning in their life by becoming engrossed in their family, in hobbies or special studies. Ambivalents also distrust organizational norms, but unlike indifferents they react by becoming critics and as far

---

<sup>7</sup>Robert Presthus, The Organization Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 205-287.



as the organization is concerned, too rebellious. The bureaucratic organization has methods to minimize the effectiveness of this troublesome critic. The persistent critic soon finds out that supervisors watch him more carefully, that informal group status is denied him, and that certain promotion channels are blocked. A bureaucracy, then, can reward or penalize workers by supplying or depriving workers with organizational opportunities for prestige, status, power and security. Workers with too many divergent criticisms about the policies of an organization often find the path to success blocked. Studies by Zaleznik and Seashore seem to indicate that members of groups with high solidarity and, thus, a fairly high degree of consensus are characterized by a homogeneity of outlook.<sup>8</sup> These members also felt that their jobs were high in status as compared with other groups of workers. A tentative conclusion is that workers who perceived that they were becoming higher in status also felt that a certain degree of conformity was necessary to insure this high status. Certainly, a tendency towards deviant behavior does not seem to be associated with actual status or even a feeling of high status.

In another study, Robert K. Merton categorized certain dysfunctional types of workers in a bureaucracy.<sup>9</sup> The inability of the workers to adapt to changed conditions came as a result of their rigid adherence to the rules of the organization, their inability to break from the past

---

<sup>8</sup>Blau, op. cit., p. 110.

<sup>9</sup>Robert K. Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Social Theory and Social Structure, Revised Edition (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), pp. 195-206.





training procedures in the face of new conditions, and their tendency to view many instrumental methods of work as ends not as means. Apparently, functional bureaucratic procedures such as a system of specified rules and policies, security of tenure and promotion, and a hierarchical administrative authority had dysfunctional effects for organizational change. In some ways, large organizations are not only able to reward conformity, but they can also tend to foster conformity through excessive bureaucratic procedures.

A dull conformity with the organizational goals, rules and methods is perhaps too pessimistic an outlook for professional organizations. Blau contends that job security, consistent channels of promotion, professional standards of work internalized within workers and evaluation on the basis of results rather than on the basis of processes leading to results are aspects of a bureaucracy that can aid workers in exerting some initiative and ingenuity within their work.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, bureaucracies also aid change by collecting groups of workers together in co-operative, collaborative situations.

Blau's analysis depends on a few important conditions being present in the large social organization. Freedom and security will aid change processes only if the individuals themselves see a need to institute changes. Some individuals will change conditions out of a creative impulse, others out

---

<sup>10</sup> Peter M. Blau, Bureaucracy in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1956), pp. 61-67.





of a need to avoid boredom and others out of a need to satisfy some psychological want such as power or status. If power or status is being rewarded by conformity then it is doubtful whether a sense of security will create conditions for aiding changes in an organization. As Blau mentions in another book, individuals will advance new ideas in a group only as long as there is a free flow of communications.<sup>11</sup> Organizations with hierarchical authority patterns tend to discourage change. Thus, organizations in which there are distinct levels of supervision might be inhibiting rather than aiding change processes. Furthermore, the changes that might occur in professional organizations under the conditions mentioned above are concerned mainly with changes in the ideas or work methods of individual members or small groups. Large scale organizational changes, changes in the main goals and policies of the organization, which in turn imply changes in the roles, norms, and sanctions held by workers themselves, may not be necessarily furthered by the conditions cited by Blau.

## II. PRINCIPAL SUCCESSION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

### Leadership Succession in Social Organizations

The analysis presented in the previous section of this chapter indicated that members of a social organization tend to resist major organizational changes because of their unsettling effect upon the social system. This analysis did not differentiate between leaders of an

---

<sup>11</sup>Blau, Formal Organizations, op. cit., p. 128.



organization and their subordinates within the organization. Leaders, especially those at the apex of the organization, are in a better strategic position to institute changes because of their acknowledged status, authority and control over some aspects of the organizational norms and sanctions. If the leader has successfully integrated himself with the informal group, he is able to resist group pressures for conformity with respect to those norms that are not basic to the group's value system.<sup>12</sup> However, as Homans points out, high status in an informal group is a reward for group conformity and low status is a penalty paid for deviation.<sup>13</sup> In instituting changes, it would seem to depend again on the nature of the changes anticipated, and on the degree to which the formal leader is accepted by the informal group.

However, when instituting changes, leaders would seem to be constrained by the same forces that constrain subordinates. These constraints, though, may be more or less demanding upon the leader, depending upon his formal or informal status. In comparing leaders who come from outside the organization with leaders who are appointed from members within the organization, these constraints would seem to affect the insider more than the outsider. The insider normally is more oriented to the group norms than the outsider. He has an understanding of the formal and informal organization of the system as it has existed. The outsider, however, is not necessarily oriented to the group norms. Furthermore, he has no intimate understanding of the formal and informal

---

<sup>12</sup>Blau, op. cit., p. 106.    <sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 104.



organization and may be more apt to institute changes that might lead to some instability within the system. This fear of 'rocking the boat' is an important constraint for the insider who owes his allegiance to the organizational system as it exists at present. Although the insider may have more status in the informal groups within the organization, his loyalty, conformity and orientation to the present organization would seem to put him at a greater disadvantage when instituting changes.

The following section will examine, in more detail, these constraints facing inside and outside successors when they introduce changes in a school.

#### Psychological Constraints Upon Principals

The insider is more constrained in instituting changes because he possesses an intellectual perspective of the organization which is oriented and patterned towards the organizational methods and purposes that existed under the former principal. Whenever he is faced with a problem he calls in this frame of reference which colors his efforts to think of alternative solutions. Even if alternative solutions seem more rational, the emotional feelings associated with this frame of reference hinder his ability to perceive alternative solutions. Unlike the outsider whose perspective of the organization has not been structured by any previous experience within the organization and whose feelings are not particularly associated with this perspective, the insider may be unable to perceive alternative methods of organizing the school.





The insider has also become adjusted to routines and habits which may be associated by some degree of security and satisfaction. To alter these routines and habits radically might cause some personal pain and insecurity. A change, therefore, may be a threat to satisfying, predictable, and established routines and habits of organization. If the teachers within the organization have also settled into an established routine and appear content with the status quo, then neither the leader nor the group members may be able to recognize any dysfunctional procedures that could be changed.

However, if the insider has not really accepted the methods and purposes existing in the system or if he nourishes some strong personal dislike for the former leader and identifies him with his methods, he may not be so emotionally committed to the organization as it existed under the former principal. Upon becoming principal he might really act like an outsider, especially if the staff also has some strong personal or intellectual dissatisfactions with the organizational methods used by his predecessor. In Presthus's terms this type of insider is really an outsider or an 'ambivalent.'<sup>14</sup> The ambivalent is characterized by introversion, specialized theoretical orientations, a fear of authority, a strong sense of individual self-concern and an inability to conform to the norms of a large social organization. Thus, he is prone to institute changes because of his fastidious concern with perfection and his inability to whole-heartedly support the organization 'as is.'

---

<sup>14</sup>Presthus, op. cit., pp. 257-287.



Sociological Constraints--Heritage of Loyalty

The insider's difficulties in instituting change are not only a result of his psychological orientation towards the school organization as it existed under the leadership of a former principal. He also is constrained by his heritage of loyalty towards the school system and the school itself. In most instances, it was his acknowledged loyalty to the school system which gave him his present position. When promoted, the insider may feel a degree of allegiance to the system that would reduce his incentive to violate any of the major goals, purposes and methods of the system. If his immediate supervisors or the staff seem securely ensconced in a status quo situation acceptable to them, any important changes he might entertain would seem disloyal and perhaps even destructive to the organization. Any disruption in the stability of the school, or in changes that might endanger the security of the staff or students might reflect upon his ability as an administrator. Furthermore, the decreased social control as a consequence of too much change and instability might cause conflicts and disturbances between teachers, students and parents that could filter up to the school board and superintendent. His image or 'good name' as an administrator could be at stake in some imagined consequences of major change.

However, there is a type of outsider who may also be a type of insider. This type of outsider may find organizational goals and methods between one school and another so similar that he may forego any notions of change. He may also, like the insider, become too conscious of his relationships with supervisory personnel. In an effort to ingratiate



himself with supervisors and teachers this type of outsider might be quite conservative in making changes. Presthus has characterized a third type of psycho-sociological reaction to organizations as an 'upward mobile.'<sup>15</sup> This upward mobile is essentially a conformer, a leader who can compromise controversial issues, an extrovert, and a student of human relations. Action and decision, not ideas and contemplation are central to his administrative behavior. His main motivational force is a need for status and power. Seeman found that mobile status seekers (leaders who were predominantly interested in achieving status and power, yet moved from position to position, and company to company) had a low change score.<sup>16</sup> Thus, the psychological disposition of the newcomer may be an important factor in knowing whether he is truly an external agent of change in a school or school system. Although this condition could be important, the contention of this study would be that outsiders, as principals, would tend to be more truly outside the system than insiders. Some further evidence is indicated by the following study.

In a study by W. Richard Scott it was found that workers in a government service agency who expressed a definite degree of loyalty to the local organization tended to be workers with fewer professional characteristics.<sup>17</sup> These 'cosmopolitans,' as Gouldner refers to them,

---

<sup>15</sup>Presthus, op. cit., pp. 164-205.

<sup>16</sup>Melvin Seeman, "Social Mobility and Administrative Behavior," American Sociological Review, XXIII (September, 1958), pp. 633-642.

<sup>17</sup>Blau, Formal Organizations, op. cit., pp. 64-69.







were characterized by their deeper interest in their particular professional fields or areas of study. They were termed cosmopolitans because they were more liable to move from the local organization to another professional organization that offered more opportunities to specialize in their particular field. The locals were not prone to move and were more concerned with adhering to the bureaucratic policies, methods and rules laid down by the local organization. The professionally oriented workers, however, were more critical of the organization itself, especially those aspects of the organization dealing with administrative procedures, rules and regulations.

This study also found that this relationship between cosmopolitans and locals in their loyalty to their organization was only true when the structure of the local organization restricted professional advancement.<sup>18</sup> If the local organization provided much opportunity for professional advancement, this relationship was not so tenable. When the local organization restricted professional advancement, the workers who expressed their loyalty to the organization did so at the expense of professional commitments. However, workers who did not want to forsake their professional commitments could have followed one of two paths. Either they devoted their specialized energies to internal professional tasks or they moved into an administrative position. In administrative positions, they could again become locals or they could decide to move to 'greener pastures' and, thus, become cosmopolitans in an administrative profession.

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 70-71.



Relating this study to school systems it might be found that teachers in school systems that are fairly small would seem to be in organizations that restrict professional advancement. If they remain within the organization, even in an administrative capacity, it might be expected that they would tend to be locals in orientation. If they decided to move and seek higher administrative positions then they might be expected to become more cosmopolitan in orientation and, thus, more likely to institute change.

Teachers in school systems that are quite large might be in organizations that permit a certain degree of professional advancement. However, in the case of most teachers this advancement would lead to administrative positions. Unless they moved from one system to another occasionally they might also be a type of local in the administrative profession. Thus, inside successors, and to some extent, outside successors in the same school system would tend to be locally oriented in the administrative profession. They might be characterized by loyalty to the system and a general acceptance of the existing organizational policies and regulations. Outside successors to a school system, though, might tend to be more cosmopolitan in their outlook, more critical of organizational methods and more likely to institute changes oriented towards the administrative profession, as distinct from the teaching profession.

#### Heritage of Social Relationships

The insider is also constrained in instituting changes because of his ties of friendships with members of the staff. Because he has achieved status in some informal group he may find it difficult to manage



certain interest groups because of his past associations with them.

In a case study, Carlson related the case of a superintendent who was hampered in changing an elementary arithmetic program because of his past friendship and peer association with the arithmetic supervisor.<sup>19</sup> When this supervisor opposed changes made by the director of elementary education, he used his contacts with the teachers and his past position of power to undermine the arithmetic program. Carlson concludes that:

In the conflict that developed between Williams, the supervisor and the new director of the elementary program, all actions, positions taken and positions not taken were interpreted in the light of the "past" power of Williams and "past" social friendship of Rodgers and Williams. . . . Rodgers should dismiss the past, but those who knew him could not.<sup>20</sup>

An inside successor may also be hampered in making changes because his definition of needed changes may run counter to certain favours and rewards that his friends expect as a result of his promotion. They, in effect, count on fulfilling their expectations, because after all, the 'boss' was and still is their friend. The inside successor may find himself in a rather difficult situation. If he follows his or higher supervisory's expectations, he may alienate some friends who may be rather powerful and influential in the informal organization. He may depend upon them to create satisfactory informal relationships which may be essential for the maintenance of morale and job satisfaction. If he bows to their wishes, he may not be able to effect certain changes that he or the upper supervisory staff feel are desirable. Principals are

---

<sup>19</sup>Richard O. Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change (Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre, The University of Chicago, 1962), p. 54.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.







frequently in the middle of such an ambivalent situation but inside successors would find the situation more difficult to control because of their heritage of social relationships.

### Knowledge of Feed-Back

In an earlier section of this chapter it was suggested that an organization responds to feed-back to 'tip it off' about external forces which might threaten the equilibrium of the organization. The inside successor in a school presumably would have more knowledge of the informal situation within the school, the various formal and informal roles that teachers and students occupied, the understood traditional norms and sanctions (especially types of punishment), and the situational factors in the home and community which might affect the organizational methods used in the school. This knowledge of the total formal and informal situation prevailing under the leadership of the former principal may not be entirely adequate, but it would be much more detailed and comprehensive than the knowledge that an outsider would possess. If the insider is concerned about maintaining the equilibrium within the school, he possesses enough understanding of the situation and has enough social contacts with teachers, students, supervisors and parents to maintain the steady state of the organization as it existed under the former principal.

The outsider, however, would not have a very precise understanding of the formal situation in the school and would be almost entirely ignorant about the informal situation. The very lack of knowledge about feed-back processes might cause him to institute changes



without intentionally seeking to do so. If he attempts to bide his time until he has acquired some knowledge of the situation, he will be accused of being an 'inactive principal.' Decisions must be made and his lack of social contacts and practical knowledge of the situation will force him to institute procedures that are somewhat different from those that existed under the former principal.

Because the insider does have friends and some understanding of the informal status and norms of various groups of teachers in the school, then, under certain conditions, he may be able to effect changes. One of these conditions might occur when an insider is able to win the loyalty of status groups of teachers, and become accepted as leader within some of these groups. If he had some prior plan of change in mind, he could have a decided advantage over the outsider in instituting changes. The loyalty of the staff to his purposes and highly cohesive work groups could actually facilitate changes. More important, these changes might be accepted more readily by the staff. Because of the insiders' understanding of the teachers in their informal situations, they may also be able to create better conditions of freedom and security for individual innovation and ingenuity.

However, these conditions favoring the insiders' greater ability to institute changes hold true only when the insider has a definite plan of change, and is willing to promote this plan of change by working through informal groups. If the insider is not accepted by the staff as an informal leader, if he is overcome by the conservative forces in the staff, and if the teachers, themselves, show little professional concern



for innovations, the insider will not have any unique advantage over the outsider.

### Expectations

The outside successor has one more advantage in instituting changes within the organization. His major reference groups actually expect him to make more changes. In Carlson's study, the school board appointed an outside applicant for the superintendent's position because they wanted organizational change.<sup>21</sup> By saying what is wrong with the system at present, the board was, in effect, suggesting change. They were willing to give the outsider the freedom and support to act on organizational problems. With the insider, however, the board merely offered him the position knowing that there were no serious problems of the organization and, thus, expected him to preserve the pattern of administration set by his predecessor. The coming of an outsider to a school might heighten the staff's concern with the possibility of changes, whereas the appointment of an insider would only confirm to the teachers the necessity for retaining the status quo.

In Carlson's study, when the employees knew that an outsider was coming to lead the organization they actually prepared for his coming by changing the nature of their informal groups.<sup>22</sup> There was solidification of informal relationships within the hierarchical levels. For example, the elementary principals got together for a card game for the first time in many years. When an insider was appointed to

---

<sup>21</sup>Carlson, op. cit., p. 22.      <sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 40-51.





the superintendency there was no solidification within hierarchical levels. Old rifts and old interest groups were not forgotten even within the same hierarchical level. Carlson interprets this difference between the outsider and the insider in their effect upon the informal groups within the school system as an advantage for the outsider. The insider faces an informal situation that is structured, whereas the outsider faces a social system that is temporarily suspended. When the outsider assumes office there are a number of strong interest groups which have welded together because of his arrival. Thus, Carlson says that the outsider can capitalize on these closely identified units in the school because he can attract or repel those individuals and groups which are committed to a certain course of action. In a sense, he is like the army commander who can 'reshape the conflict' because of the temporary unsettlement and strong neutral groups within the informal relationships.<sup>23</sup>

In Gouldner's study, though, closely knit informal groups actually obstructed the anticipated change.<sup>24</sup> Again, in the case of an outsider appointed to the principalship of a school, the nature of the informal groups might be the determining factor in deciding whether an outsider can effect any important changes. Although the outsider might institute changes unacceptable to the staff, the relative stability of the informal groups in the organization would constrain the insider in instituting any kind of changes unless there was a high

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>24</sup>Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 70-85.



frequency of staff turn-over.

### III. THE CONSEQUENCES OF CHANGES INSTITUTED BY SUCCESSORS

Whether they originate from inside or outside the organization, Carlson noted that leadership successors in the superintendent's position tended to become preoccupied with rule-making. Rules call attention to the identity of the successor because they attempt to structure the organizational situation according to his frame of reference. Making many rules also substitutes for more major decisions that have to wait until the superintendent understands the situation more. Carlson noted that outsiders tend to institute rules that alter the present situation, whereas insiders make rules that tighten the organization as it exists.<sup>25</sup>

Gouldner discovered that the outside successor tended to concentrate on instituting extensive rules.<sup>26</sup> In his case study the employees were quite satisfied with the methods and procedures developed by the predecessor and they were quite content to follow past routine. The board of directors brought a successor to increase production. However, Peele, the successor, was unable to create informal solidarity with the workers because first, his program of changes was not accepted by the workers and second, because he had no concrete way of becoming acquainted with the employees. Without some social link he could not understand their personal problems and their social relationships.

---

<sup>25</sup>Carlson, op. cit., p. 40. <sup>26</sup>Gouldner, op. cit., pp. 70-85.



Eventually, he had to develop a framework of rules defining the minimum level of performance and the necessary sanctions that would accompany deviation. However, this framework of rules only led to a need for closer supervision.

Gouldner's conclusions were that close supervision and rule-making, which were essentially bureaucratic techniques designed to substitute for a lack of internal conformity on the part of the workers for Peele's program of change, helped subordinate supervisors in their tasks of enforcing Peele's expectations. The rules defined and pointed out to the workers the legitimate demands that the supervisors could insist on. Although these rules helped reduce the tensions between supervisors and workers, in general, the closely knit informal groups of underground miners resisted these bureaucratic tendencies. Gouldner concluded that the bureaucratic efforts of the outside successor only led to low motivation and inadequate role performance.

In another case study by Guest, the outside successor did not have to resort to bureaucratic methods because the employees were dissatisfied with the predecessor and his method of administration.<sup>27</sup> An inside successor would have tended to perpetuate this situation. What was needed there was a social change--a new manager, to break the pattern of social relationships developed under the former manager. Thus, there seems no definite pattern as to the consequences of change instituted by outsiders. The kind of change seems to depend upon the

---

<sup>27</sup>Robert M. Guest, Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorey Press, Inc., and Richard W. Irwin Inc., 1962), pp. 106-117.





informal groups within the organization and the type of situation under the predecessor. If the predecessor commanded the loyalty of the workers, the outsider may be constrained to institute a framework of rules, accompanied by close supervision. If the predecessor did not command the loyalty of the workers, then the successor has a greater opportunity to appeal to the informal groups within the organization. In summary, the lack of feed-back on the part of the outsider would seem to indicate that he is forced to institute some kind of changes. The actual nature of these changes would depend on various circumstances. Probably the most important circumstances are the nature of informal groups within the organization and their attitude to the previous administration.

#### IV. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The main theoretical framework for this study was based upon an analysis of organizational equilibrium. The equilibrium theory states that the stability of an organization is a state in which opposing social forces from inside and outside the organization are brought under control so that the main functions and purposes of the organization may be achieved. Organizational stability is maintained by a process of indoctrination of group norms and sanctions and by a process of feed-back. Serious conflicts and pressures for radical change are, thus, contained or minimized within the organization. However, this equilibrium is not static, but a process of continual adjustment of social forces in time. Changes occur, but they are minor and spaced over a period of time.



A review of the literature and a consideration of the equilibrium theory revealed that outsiders are probably capable of instituting more changes than insiders. Their lack of a previous psychological and sociological orientation in the organization and their ignorance of the feed-back processes were some of the major conditions that allowed the outsider to institute more changes than the insider.

In some instances, the psychological disposition of the successor may be an important factor in determining whether insiders or outsiders are truly inside or outside the school situation. The 'status-seeker,' unwilling to offend personnel, may not be a real external change agent. The 'ambivalent' insider who has not internalized the norms of the organization may act like an external force upon the organizational system in the school.

In some ways, the insider's knowledge of the organizational feed-back and his understanding of the personal and social wants of the staff can be an advantage when instituting changes. However, the very knowledge that helps the insider in getting the staff to accept changes may actually thwart his attempts to institute changes. Unless the insider can stand by his ideas for change, a previous orientation with the conditions and personnel in the school can reduce his ability to institute changes.

Resorts to close supervision and formal rules as a method of changing workers' performances only alienated many of the workers in one study where the successor was appointed from outside the organization. Since the outsider might have a tendency to use bureaucratic



procedures more than the insider and since he does not understand the organizational situation as fully as the insider, changes instituted by him may not receive the acceptance of many personnel in the organization.





## CHAPTER III

### THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF RESEARCH

#### I. THE PROBLEM

##### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between principal succession and organizational change. The main problem was to compare the outside and inside successors on the extent and nature of changes instituted by them in schools.

##### Sub-Problems

The sub-problems were concerned with the effect of instituted organizational changes upon the teachers in schools of outside and inside successors. In other words, do teachers in schools of inside and outside successors find changes more satisfactory than lack of changes? Another sub-problem was concerned with the effect of changes in organizational rules upon teachers in schools of inside and outside successors. Do teachers in schools of inside and outside successors find changes in organizational rules more satisfactory than lack of changes in rules?

##### Hypotheses

The problem and sub-problems were re-stated in major research and null hypotheses.

1. (a) Outside successors institute more organizational changes than inside successors.



1. (b) There is no significant difference between inside and outside successors on the number or kind of organizational changes instituted.

This hypothesis follows logically from the research presented in Chapter II. Insiders were more restricted in their ability to institute changes. Knowledge of past practices, loyalties to the school and school system, a heritage of social relationships and an understanding of organizational feed-back were factors which constrained insiders in instituting changes.

2. (a) Outside successors with no previous administrative or teaching experience in the school system institute more organizational changes than outsiders with some previous experience in the school system.
2. (b) There is no significant difference between outside successors with no previous administrative or teaching experience in the school system and outside successors with some previous administrative or teaching experience on the number or kind of organizational changes instituted.

There are basically two types of outsiders. Those outsiders with no acquaintance of the school system were characterized in Chapter II as more cosmopolitan and more mobile than outsiders with some previous acquaintance with the school system. The outsiders who had been in the school system for several years were characterized as locals in the school system. They were more loyal to the school system, and, as a result, more oriented to the policies and procedures of the school system. The



cosmopolitans were oriented towards the administrative profession rather than the teaching profession. Because of this cosmopolitan administrative orientation these outsiders were more critical of existing patterns of organization in the school system. Being more critical, they probably would institute more organizational changes.

3. (a) Teachers in schools of inside successors find changes implemented by the new principal more satisfactory than lack of changes.

3. (b) In schools with inside successors as principals there is no significant difference between the teachers' satisfaction with changes implemented and their satisfaction with a maintenance of the status quo in the organization of the school.

Although insiders would tend to institute fewer changes, the changes instituted would probably be accepted by the staff. There are three reasons why the staff would accept changes. First, the minor nature and frequency of changes would not disturb the stability of the school very seriously. This stability would probably satisfy most teachers. Second, the insiders' familiarity with the staff and organizational procedures would help them in knowing what kind of changes would be accepted by the staff. Third, the predominate conservative forces in the school would be satisfied by the maintenance of the status quo. Only the smaller liberal forces would be annoyed with the status quo. Thus, an overwhelming acceptance of implemented changes could be expected.

4. (a) Teachers in schools of outside successors find changes





implemented by the new principal less satisfactory than lack of changes.

4. (b) In schools with inside successors as principals there is no significant difference between the teachers' satisfaction with changes implemented and their satisfaction with a maintenance of the status quo in the organization of the school.

This hypothesis parallels hypothesis number two in that change and lack of change are being compared. That the teachers would find changes more annoying in schools of outsiders follows somewhat from the theory of equilibrium. Since the outsider would probably institute more changes and since these changes would be more bureaucratic in nature, it is reasonable to expect that the teachers would find these changes rather unacceptable. The predominate conservative forces in the school would probably become somewhat annoyed by the presence of an outsider with his new ideas and methods. The liberal forces, on the other hand, would be satisfied with the outsider and his program of change. Hypotheses two and three, then, sum up the differential effect of the insiders' and outsiders' program of change upon the teachers in both categories of schools.

5. (a) Outside successors institute more organizational rules than inside successors.
5. (b) There is no significant difference between inside and outside successors on instituting organizational rules.

In one study cited in Chapter II, the outsider used more bureaucratic procedures such as rule-making and close supervision to enforce



his plan of change. Because the insider has a greater informal link with the staff he would not use bureaucratic procedures as much as outsiders. In all likelihood, he would rely more on an informal approach in instituting changes. Thus, it might be expected that outsiders would institute more changes in organizational rules than insiders.

6. (a) Teachers in schools of inside successors find changes in organizational rules more satisfactory than teachers in schools of outsiders.

6. (b) There is no significant difference between teachers in schools of outside and inside successors in their satisfaction with changes in organizational rules.

Rules are an impersonal method for enforcing decisions. Principals who attempt to enforce decisions by making changes in rules would probably annoy more teachers than principals who might use more informal procedures. If the outsider does institute more changes, it is likely these changes will not be accepted as well as changes instituted by the insider.

## II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The need for this study arose in two different ways. First, there was a need to determine if some of the research on change processes in social organizations could be validated in schools and school systems. Much of the theory presented in Chapter II arose out of studies in industrial organizations. The consequences of change upon the equilibrium of a social organization and the nature of changes instituted by leaders



have not been related in any direct way to school systems. In particular, the thesis that an external leader was an innovator while the internal leader was a stabilizer held true for superintendents in Carlson's study.<sup>28</sup> There was a need to determine if this thesis applied in some ways to principals of schools. There was also a need to determine if some of the concepts about change processes in industrial organizations could be useful in analyzing social organizations in schools.

The need for this study also arose in a second way. Because of rapid changes in society the school has been forced to adapt its goals and methods of organization. Technological advances in society, political and scientific struggles for nuclear and space supremacy, and the tremendous flux in social values have had their impact on the curricula and administration of schools and school systems. Thus, there was a need to determine how these changes could be introduced into schools, and also, a need to determine how teachers would react to instituted organizational changes.

Although many changes are instituted at the top level of the educational system by departments of education and administrative staffs of major school systems, changes can also occur at the more decentralized level of the schools themselves. The development of larger, centralized schools has actually increased the potentiality of significant changes being made at school levels. In conjunction with the development of large, centralized schools has come the development of the principal's

---

<sup>28</sup>Richard O. Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1962), p. 40.







role as an educational leader. Instead of being just a head teacher with some supervisory functions, he is becoming a leader responsible for developing and fostering major organizational changes in the school. Cunningham notes that the principal is a strategic figure as an internal agent of change.<sup>29</sup> There is some sense, then, in studying how he can introduce changes in a school. Although principals can introduce changes there is no guarantee that the teachers will automatically accept these changes. Changes are only transitory if they are not internalized by teachers. Thus, there is some need in studying how teachers accept changes instituted by different types of principals.

In summary, this study was considered to be significant because it attempted to relate some theoretical and empirical research in social organization to schools. Noting the need for changes in schools, this study was also considered significant in isolating one set of conditions that restrict principals in instituting change and in studying how these changes were accepted by teachers.

### III. ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that most teachers were capable of perceiving and remembering significant organizational changes that have occurred in a school year over a period of one year.

Since the principal is the nominal authority and leader in the school, it was assumed that he is directly or indirectly responsible for

---

<sup>29</sup>Luvern L. Cunningham, "Effecting Organizational Change," The 1962 Alberta Principal's Leadership Course (July, 1962), p. 104.



many organizational changes instituted in the school. Further, it was assumed that changes for which the principal has no responsibility will occur with equal frequency in schools which have inside successors and outside successors as principals.

#### IV. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was delimited to:

1. Schools in which there had been a change of principals in 1962 and 1963.
2. All public and separate schools in the Province of Alberta with six or more teachers.
3. Schools that had existed for three or more years.
4. Schools in which there were three or more teachers who had taught under two principals.
5. Schools that had not changed their general nature for three school years beginning in 1961-62 because of some change in their purpose or function or some major change in the size of the school (e.g., change from an academic to a vocational high school).

This study was further delimited in that only formal and informal organizational changes perceived and remembered by a sample of at least three teachers in any one school were considered as proper data for the study. These organizational changes excluded:

1. Personality changes in teachers or principals.
2. Changes in the organizational climate, e.g., morale.
3. Changes of values, attitudes, emotions or sentiments on the part of pupils, teachers or principals.



## V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Because the findings of this study apply generally to all groups of schools, they are not applicable as a statement of recommended policy for any particular school or school system.

## VI. DEFINITION OF TERMS

### Change

The term 'change' was defined as any differences that teachers were able to perceive in the organization. These changes were perceived by teachers as being relative to the practices, conditions and situations that were recognizable as a constant situation under the former principal as compared to the practices, conditions and situations that existed under his successor.

These differences included any characteristics of the organization that had been:

- (1) altered or modified in terms of (a) time at which they occurred, (b) the place they occurred, (c) the function and purpose they perform, (d) the manner or methods used to carry out these functions, and (e) the personnel employed to carry out these functions;
- (2) substituted by other characteristics;
- (3) deleted or added;
- (4) converted to new functions or purposes.

### Formal Organization

The words 'formal organization' referred to any features of the school that are concerned with:





- (1) allocating functions to various personnel (e.g., teacher, students, vice-principal, principal);
- (2) methods of achieving certain organizational purposes (e.g., policies, procedures, rules, criteria);
- (3) the methods of communication among personnel;
- (4) the formal work relationships that develop among personnel;
- (5) the nature of organizational methods and procedures.

### Informal Organization

The words 'informal organization' referred to the groupings and relationships that develop among teachers and principals because of their association as co-operative employees in a school situation.

### Inside Successor

The words 'inside successor' referred to any teacher or administrator who had previous professional teaching or administrative experience within the school in which he subsequently became principal.

### Outside Successor

The words 'outside successor' referred to any teacher or administrator who had no professional teaching or administrative experience within the school in which he subsequently became principal.

### Principal

This term referred to the head teacher and educational leader in the school.



## VII. THE RESEARCH DESIGN

### The Sample

The sample consisted of all those public and separate schools in Alberta which had a new principal in either 1962-63 or 1963-64.

The sample was selected in the following manner. Two lists of all the principals in Alberta schools during the school terms 1961-62 and 1962-63 were obtained from the Department of Education. By comparing these two lists the names of all new principals in 1962-63 were obtained. A similar list of principals for the school term 1963-64 was obtained from the Department of Education. By comparing the list of principals in 1962-63 with the list of principals during 1963-64 the names of all new principals for 1963-64 were obtained.

The original sample consisted, then, of all new principals in Alberta schools in 1962-63 and 1963-64. However, all new principals were not included in the sample because some schools did not meet with the criteria outlined in this chapter, under the heading "Delimitations of the Study." Before sending out the questionnaires, a form letter was sent to each superintendent requesting his permission to contact all new principals in his administrative unit. In some instances, principals had moved from their previous positions. In other instances, the superintendent did not reply to this form letter. Thus, more principals were excluded from the original sample. The final sample consisted of principals in 194 public and separate schools in Alberta.



### Nature of the Instrument

An instrument was constructed to record the teachers' perception of changes and their desirability of changes on various features of the formal and informal organization of the school. This instrument took the form of a questionnaire on which teachers were asked to respond to questions about change or desirability of change by checking yes or no.<sup>30</sup>

These questions were developed in the following manner. By reviewing the various functions and responsibilities of principals and by outlining the main areas of school-wide organizational methods, a large number of questions were formulated. Consulting various studies and books on the tasks and processes of school administration and organization helped in the process of collecting and defining the questions to be used. Some questions were suggested by teachers, principals and professors. When a large number of questions had been compiled they were cast under five major categories of school organization.<sup>31</sup> Some questions were deleted to prevent duplication and others were re-organized to provide a logical sequence of questions on the organization of the school. After the process of compiling, deleting, and re-organizing questions had been completed, ninety questions remained.

A tentative draft of the questionnaire was administered to a group of teachers attending summer school. As a result of the analysis of the written responses and personal interviews with some teachers who

---

<sup>30</sup> See Appendix B, "The Questionnaire."

<sup>31</sup> See Appendix B, "The Questionnaire."





had responded to the questionnaire, the original ninety questions were reduced to seventy-three. Some questions that the teachers found obscure were re-worded. A personal data sheet for teachers was then added to the questionnaire completing the process of development.

### Method of Collecting the Data

Each school selected in the sample was sent a packet containing six questionnaires, a personal data sheet for the principal, a return packet and a form letter. The principals were asked to distribute these questionnaires to any teachers who had taught at least one year under the former principal of the school. Where there were fewer than six teachers who met the above criterion then the principal was instructed to distribute them to as many teachers as met the criterion. The principal was asked to urge teachers to complete the questionnaire without any consultation among other teachers. He was also asked to complete his own personal data sheet and enclose it in a sealed envelope. Upon completion of the questionnaires, the teachers were asked to hand them to a teacher who was designated by the principal. This teacher did not participate in the study. He was responsible for collecting the questionnaire and the principal's envelope, enclosing them in the return packet and mailing them.

Of the 194 schools in the sample, 104 schools returned packets of questionnaires. From these 104 schools there were 452 completed questionnaires. These 452 questionnaires were scored and the scores recorded on IBM cards. The personal data from the principal's information sheet was also recorded on the IBM cards so that the teachers who



responded to the questionnaires had their responses linked with the corresponding personal data about the new principal of their school. Thus, the teachers' responses could be classified according to the type of principal in each school.

## VIII. ANALYZING THE DATA

### Dividing the Responses

The teachers' responses were divided into two basic categories. One category represented those teachers in schools of outside successors. The other category represented those teachers in schools of inside successors. For each category of teachers, frequency distributions were compiled for each item. Since each item had four possible responses to it then there were four frequency totals for each category of teachers. These four totals represented the number of teachers who perceived:

- (1) change that was satisfactory;
- (2) change that was unsatisfactory;
- (3) a lack of change that was satisfactory;
- (4) a lack of change that was unsatisfactory;

These frequency totals were converted into percentages.<sup>32</sup> For example, for each category of principal, the number of teachers who responded to change was recorded as a percentage of the total number of teachers responding to change and no change.<sup>33</sup> This procedure was

---

<sup>32</sup>See Appendix A, Supplementary Tables.

<sup>33</sup>See Appendix A, Table XV.



followed in determining the percentage of teachers finding change satisfactory,<sup>34</sup> and the percentage of teachers finding lack of change satisfactory.<sup>35</sup> These percentages provided the basis for comparisons between the two types of successors.

### Testing the Hypotheses

The major null hypotheses were first tested by performing chi square tests on all items of the questionnaire.<sup>36</sup> For each item, the frequency totals for change and lack of change were cast into a 2x2 table. An example is shown below:

| Question | Type of Principal | Number of Teachers<br>Perceiving Change | Number of Teachers<br>Perceiving No Change |
|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1.       | Outside Successor | 20                                      | 60                                         |
|          | Inside Successor  | 10                                      | 50                                         |

The results of the chi square tests yielded those items on which there was a significant degree of independence between the percentage of teachers reporting changes in schools of outside and inside successors. Probabilities were shown at the .001, .01 and .05 level. The results of these tests revealed the nature of differences between insiders and outsiders on instituting organizational change.

The method outlined above was used to determine the nature of differences between teachers in schools of outsiders and insiders in their satisfaction with changes and lack of changes. This method was

---

<sup>34</sup>See Appendix A, Table XVI.      <sup>35</sup>Ibid., Table XVII.

<sup>36</sup>George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 167-172.





also used to test null hypothesis two.

The chi square tests revealed the nature of differences between insiders and outsiders. To determine the extent of differences between insiders and outsiders the following method was used. Since chi square tests had revealed items on which there were significant differences between insiders and outsiders on instituting changes, then these items were compared to see if either type of successor had instituted more changes.

Thus, all those items on which the chi square tests had yielded significant differences were isolated. For each of these items the percentages of teachers who had perceived change in schools of inside and outside successors were compared. A minus sign was assigned to those items on which teachers reported more change in schools of outsiders and a plus sign to those items on which teachers reported more change in schools of insiders. The total number of plus and minus signs were compared by using a sign test.<sup>37</sup> Probabilities were shown at the .001, .01 and .05 level. If the number of plus and minus signs were significantly different, this test tentatively forced rejection of the null hypothesis.

An overall comparison of the extent of changes instituted by insiders and outsiders consisted of comparing all items on the questionnaire on which there were differences between the per cent of teachers in schools of insiders and outsiders who saw changes. These two percentages were compared by using a sign test. A minus sign was assigned

---

<sup>37</sup>Wilfred J. Dixon and Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction To Statistical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1957), pp. 280-284.



to items on which teachers reported more change in schools of outsiders and a plus sign was assigned to items on which teachers reported more change in schools of insiders. As outlined above, the positive and negative signs were compared. A detailed tabulation of the percentages and the actual designations of positive and negative signs is shown in Table XV of Appendix A. If the total number of positive and negative signs were significantly different, the hypothesis was rejected. The significance level was .001, .01 and .05. If both the sign test on the significant items and the sign test on all items forced rejection of the hypothesis, these results were evidence that there was a significant difference between insiders and outsiders on the extent of changes instituted.

Both types of tests outlined above were used to determine if there was a significant difference between the changes teachers found satisfactory and lack of changes they found satisfactory in schools of inside and outside successors. These tests were also used in testing null hypothesis two. A detailed tabulation of the sign tests for hypotheses two, three and four are presented in Tables XVI, XVII and XVIII of Appendix A.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### I. NATURE OF THE SAMPLE

##### Description of the Principals

Table I shows the description of the principals in the study. The two groups of successors were quite equivalent on the basis of age, and administrative and teaching experience. On the basis of amount of university training the two groups were not quite as equivalent. The outside successors had more university training beyond the one degree level. Because there was a significant number of outside successors who were new to the school system, the group of outsiders had somewhat less previous administrative experience within the school system. The principals in both groups taught in schools with a similar median number of teachers. However, there were more outside successors in different types of schools. Typically, the inside successors were principals of schools with grade nine or grade twelve as the highest grade. The outsiders, though, were more often principals of schools with grade six, seven, eight and eleven as the highest grade. This difference reflected the greater number of city schools in the group of outsiders.

##### Description of Teachers

A description of the teachers in both groups of schools is shown in Table II. Teachers in schools of outside successors differed very





TABLE I  
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INSIDE AND OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

|                                                                    | Outside Successors<br>(N: 64) | Inside Successors<br>(N: 40) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Median age                                                         | 38.80                         | 37.10                        |
| Median years administrative experience                             | 6.50                          | 5.70                         |
| Median years teaching experience                                   | 7.23                          | 6.88                         |
| Median years administrative experience<br>in present school system | 5.00                          | 6.64                         |
| Median years university training                                   | 5.50                          | 4.10                         |
| Median number of teachers in school                                | 13.90                         | 12.50                        |

TABLE II  
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF TEACHERS IN BOTH CATEGORIES OF PRINCIPALS

|                                                       | Outside Successors<br>(N: 280) | Inside Successors<br>(N: 164) |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Median age                                            | 42.53                          | 42.64                         |
| Median years university training                      | 1.82                           | 1.80                          |
| Median years teaching experience                      | 13.57                          | 12.25                         |
| Median years teaching experience<br>in present school | 5.60                           | 4.47                          |



little from teachers in schools of inside successors. In summary, except for some small differences in the university training and administrative experience of principals, the two groups of principals and teachers were quite similar on the basic criteria of age, training and experience.

## II. COMPARISON OF OUTSIDE AND INSIDE SUCCESSORS ON INSTITUTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

### Findings--Test of Hypothesis One

Null hypothesis one states that there is no significant difference between inside and outside successors on the number or kind of organizational changes instituted. To determine the extent of change, the results of two sign tests were used. The first sign test applied to all those items on which chi square tests had yielded significant differences between insiders and outsiders on instituting organizational change. The other sign test was applied to all the items on the questionnaire. Both sign tests tested the differences between the proportion of items on which outsiders or insiders instituted more change. Table III shows the results of both sign tests. The tests show that outsiders instituted organizational change on significantly more items than insiders. Table IV also shows that global response of the teachers to change was significant in the direction of the outsider.

### Nature of Differences in Changes Instituted

Table IV shows the organizational features on which outsiders instituted more change than insiders. These features were mainly in the



TABLE III  
COMPARISON OF OUTSIDERS AND INSIDERS ON INSTITUTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

| Type of Comparison                                                                                         | Results of Sign Tests                     |                                            |                             |                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                                            | Items with<br>More Change<br>For Insiders | Items with<br>More Change<br>For Outsiders | Total<br>Number of<br>Items | Sig.<br>Level     |
| 1. Those items with significant differences between outsiders, insiders in percentage of change instituted | 2                                         | 18                                         | 20                          | .001              |
| 2. All items with differences between outsiders, insiders in percentage of change instituted               | 12                                        | 59                                         | 71                          | .001 <sup>a</sup> |

<sup>a</sup>For a more detailed analysis of the sign tests see Table XV, Appendix A.





TABLE IV  
ITEMIZED DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OUTSIDE AND INSIDE SUCCESSORS  
ON INSTITUTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

| Item                                                                               | Insiders |                    | Outsiders |                    | Sig.<br>Level |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                    | N        | Per Cent<br>Change | N         | Per Cent<br>Change |               |
| 5. Function of the principal in evaluating teachers                                | 158      | 16.4               | 277       | 28.9               | .01           |
| 13. Function of the principal in providing individual consultation for teachers    | 161      | 20.5               | 272       | 34.5               | .01           |
| 22. Function of the principal in administering corporal punishment                 | 162      | 22.2               | 266       | 37.5               | .001          |
| 23. Function of teacher in delegating discipline problems                          | 159      | 19.5               | 259       | 28.6               | .05           |
| 31. Function of principal in directing and controlling extra-curricular activities | 156      | 21.8               | 255       | 34.0               | .05           |
| 33. Function of guidance counsellors                                               | 160      | 12.9               | 237       | 21.7               | .05           |
| 37. School policy regarding promotion of students                                  | 161      | 11.8               | 261       | 20.3               | .05           |
| 38. Function of principal in advising and deciding on student promotions           | 159      | 14.5               | 260       | 24.9               | .05           |
| 46. Function of principal in recording or checking pupil achievement in classes    | 158      | 15.8               | 271       | 24.7               | .05           |
| 48. Function of the principal in checking report cards                             | 160      | 8.7                | 270       | 27.8               | .001          |
| 51. Function of principal in checking pupil lates, absences, transfers             | 163      | 20.8               | 272       | 31.3               | .05           |



TABLE IV (Continued)

| Item                                                                                                                     | N   | Insiders           | N   | Outsiders          | Sig.<br>Level     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                                                          |     | Per Cent<br>Change |     | Per Cent<br>Change |                   |
| 52. Method of checking and recording year-end reports and forms                                                          | 160 | 15.0               | 264 | 26.1               | .01               |
| 55. Method of selecting or requisitioning for school books, supplies                                                     | 163 | 21.4               | 270 | 30.7               | .05               |
| 56. Method of distributing school books, supplies                                                                        | 164 | 18.9               | 271 | 30.2               | .01               |
| 59. Time that school classes begin or end in the morning or afternoon                                                    | 160 | 22.5               | 271 | 13.3               | .05 <sup>a</sup>  |
| 61. Method of informing parents about school activities and procedure                                                    | 159 | 14.5               | 245 | 34.3               | .001              |
| 63. Nature or extent of relationships between staff members and the Home and School Association                          | 156 | 13.5               | 273 | 37.1               | .001              |
| 65. The particular teachers to whom the new principal seems to grant privileges or favors                                | 149 | 10.7               | 265 | 25.3               | .001              |
| 70. The frequency with which teachers meet in informal groups during official class time                                 | 158 | 9.5                | 261 | 34.9               | .001              |
| 71. The frequency with which the principal visits the staff room at noon hour, recess, or before or after school opening | 158 | 28.5               | 239 | 9.6                | .001 <sup>a</sup> |
| 72. The frequency of change in the school organization as a whole                                                        | 164 | 60.4               | 272 | 75.8               | .01               |

<sup>a</sup> Items on which insiders instituted more change.



areas of school organization related to student supervision, achievement and promotion. Teachers in schools of outsiders reported more change than teachers in schools of insiders on items in which the principal was directly involved in discipline, supervising extra-curricular activities, supervising of students lates and absences, and checking on student achievements and promotions. This same divergence between the insider and outsider on instituting organizational change did not occur very much in the areas of teacher supervision and the informal organization. Outsiders also instituted more change in the communication channels with parents.

Whether in schools of outsiders or insiders, teachers reported fewer changes than lack of changes. There was no item in Table IV on which the percentage of teachers reporting change exceeded the percentage of teachers reporting no change.

### Summary of Findings

The results of the sign tests warrant rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the research hypothesis that outside successors institute more organizational change than inside successors. Specifically, outsiders instituted more change in organizational areas such as student supervision and communication channels with parents. Generally, teachers in both categories of schools found a lack of change more common than change.

### Discussion of Findings

That teachers reported change more infrequently than no change follows from the theory of equilibrium forces in social systems presented





in Chapter II. Principals, like other leaders, tend to concentrate more on stabilizing the main features of an organization. Changes are admitted, but only slowly and in small doses. This prevalence of stability rather than change in school organizations may mean also, that, as a group, principals face some major constraints when instituting changes. Being subordinate executives in a school system they are restricted by school board and provincial departmental regulations and policies. Since principals are dependent upon higher officials for promotions they are afraid, in some instances, to initiate major changes lest these changes disrupt the stability of the school, alienate too many teachers and possibly result in ineffective learning conditions. The image of the school to superior officials and also to the public could be a major constraint upon principals when instituting change.

Outsiders, however, seemed less affected by the psychological and sociological constraints involved in instituting changes. This result also follows from the theory presented in Chapter II. Being less constrained by knowledge of past practices, by social relationships with friends, by loyalties to the school system and by knowledge of feed-back processes in the school and school system, the outsiders appeared to be more capable of instituting organizational changes.

The outsiders, though, did not differ from the insiders in instituting changes involving the direct supervision of teachers. As newcomers to the school they probably were more concerned about the consequences that could occur when changes were made in activities directly involving teachers. This result could also be explained by the insiders'



somewhat greater ability to institute changes here because of their more intimate acquaintance with the staff. Whatever the explanation, the results of this study show that outsiders instituted more organizational change, but this change was concentrated primarily on organizational features directly affecting students. However, these changes could indirectly affect the teachers' role in the school, and to this extent, changes in student supervision might also affect teachers somewhat.

### III. A COMPARISON OF OUTSIDERS WITH NO EXPERIENCE AND SOME EXPERIENCE IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ON INSTITUTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

#### Findings--Test of Hypothesis Two

Null hypothesis two states that there is no significant difference between outside successors with no previous teaching or administrative experience in the school system and outside successors with some previous teaching or administrative experience in the school system on the number or kind of organizational changes instituted.

The analysis of the extent of changes instituted by either category of outside successor is presented in Table V. The results of both sign tests were highly significant at the .001 level. In both sets of proportions the outsider with no experience in the school system instituted change on significantly more items than the outsider with some experience in the school system.

#### Nature of Differences in Changes Instituted

Table VI shows that the outsiders with no experience instituted



TABLE V

RELATIONSHIP OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM TO THE  
EXTENT OF CHANGES INSTITUTED BY OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Type of Comparison                                                                               | Results of Sign Tests                                             |                                                                     |                             |                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                                  | Items with More<br>Change for<br>Successors with<br>No Experience | Items with More<br>Change for<br>Successors with<br>Some Experience | Total<br>Number<br>of Items | Sig.<br>Level     |
| 1. Those items with<br>significant dif-<br>ferences in the<br>percentage of<br>change instituted | 12                                                                | 2                                                                   | 14                          | .001              |
| 2. All items with dif-<br>ferences in the<br>percentage of change<br>instituted                  | 56                                                                | 15                                                                  | 71                          | .001 <sup>a</sup> |

<sup>a</sup>For a more detailed analysis of the sign tests see Table XVIII, Appendix A.

more change in two general areas of school organization. One was the area of extra-curricular activities, the other, the area of pupil accounting. As in the comparison of the outsiders and insiders in instituting change the differences in organizational change between the two types of outside successors were not concentrated around changes in the supervision, consultation or informal behaviour of teachers, but concentrated more around changes in the supervision and organization of pupil personnel services.

#### Summary

The evidence from the chi square and sign tests was sufficient to





TABLE VI

RELATIONSHIP OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE IN A SCHOOL SYSTEM TO THE  
NATURE OF CHANGES INSTITUTED BY OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Item                                                                                                                                                                    | Successors with<br>No Experience |          | Successors with<br>Some Experience |          | Sig.<br>Level    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                         | N                                | % Change | N                                  | % Change |                  |
| 14. Nature or extent of group consultation activities in the school (e.g. action research, in-service education programs, group observation of demonstration teaching). | 92                               | 29.3     | 163                                | 18.4     | .01              |
| 23. Function of teacher in delegating difficult discipline problems to principal, vice-principal or (a) guidance counselor(s).                                          | 93                               | 20.4     | 161                                | 33.5     | .05 <sup>a</sup> |
| 27. Nature or extent of organized sports activities within school (e.g. houseleague basketball, clubs, dances, rallies, graduation exercises, etc.)                     | 93                               | 43.0     | 164                                | 26.2     | .01              |
| 29. Method of organizing or controlling all extra-curricular activities in school                                                                                       | 90                               | 35.6     | 161                                | 22.4     | .05              |
| 31. Function of principal in regard to directing, scheduling or controlling extra-curricular activities                                                                 | 92                               | 41.3     | 164                                | 25.0     | .001             |
| 33. Function of guidance counsellor(s) in the guidance program of school                                                                                                | 85                               | 29.4     | 152                                | 17.1     | .05              |



TABLE VI (Continued)

| Item                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Successors with<br>No Experience |          | Successors with<br>Some Experience |          | Sig.<br>Level    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | N                                | % Change | N                                  | % Change |                  |
| 37. General school policy regarding promotion or non-promotion of students                                                                                                                                                                                              | 84                               | 28.6     | 165                                | 16.9     | .05              |
| 44. Function of standardized tests used in the school (e.g., intelligence, achievement, aptitude, diagnostic)                                                                                                                                                           | 95                               | 23.2     | 175                                | 9.2      | .01              |
| 47. Methods or symbols used to record pupil achievement on reports of pupil progress sent to parents                                                                                                                                                                    | 94                               | 26.6     | 173                                | 12.7     | .01              |
| 49. Function of cumulative record cards in school                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 98                               | 20.4     | 174                                | 9.8      | .01              |
| 50. Function of teacher in entering, checking or filing cumulative cards                                                                                                                                                                                                | 97                               | 22.7     | 175                                | 8.0      | .001             |
| 58. Function of principal in managing or supervising school plant or in supervising teachers' responsibility for maintaining neat or tidy classroom (e.g., checking cupboards, rooms and halls, for neatness, cleanliness; checking lighting and ventilation in school) | 93                               | 26.9     | 176                                | 13.1     | .01              |
| 63. Nature or extent of relationships between school staff and members of Home & School Ass'n                                                                                                                                                                           | 87                               | 11.5     | 163                                | 22.7     | .01 <sup>a</sup> |
| 71. Frequency with which principal visits staff room at noon hour, recess, or before or after school opening                                                                                                                                                            | 92                               | 41.3     | 161                                | 24.8     | .01              |

<sup>a</sup>Items on which successors with some experience instituted more change.



reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis that outsiders with no experience in the school system institute more change than outsiders with some experience in the school system. The outsider with no experience in the school system instituted more change in the areas of student supervision and organization, especially extra-curricular activities.

### Discussion

Of both types of outsiders the newcomers to the school system were most able to institute organizational changes. This result agreed with the general theoretical distinction between outsiders and insiders. The newcomers to the system were more truly outside the school than the outsiders who did have some experience in the system. As outlined in Chapter II, the outsiders within the school system were constrained in instituting changes by their loyalty and psychological orientation towards the school system. The newcomers to the system, however, were probably less loyal and less oriented to the peculiar procedures and objectives of the school system. The result of this comparison between the two kinds of outsiders added some support to the theory that newcomers to the system may be more cosmopolitan in their approach to school administration. Like the cosmopolitans in Gouldner's study they would be more oriented to administration as a profession distinct from teaching, and thus, more mobile and less loyal to one particular school system. This study did not validate all of these characteristics, but insofar as these characteristics might be linked with more change, then this study did support the type of theoretical analysis presented by Gouldner.





IV. THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES IN SCHOOLS  
OF INSIDE SUCCESSORS

Findings--Test of Hypothesis Three

Null hypothesis three states that in schools with inside successors there is no significant difference between teachers' satisfaction with changes implemented and their satisfaction with a maintenance of the status quo. The results of the sign tests are presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII

A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES  
AND LACK OF CHANGES IN SCHOOLS OF INSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Type of Comparison                                                                                                      | Results of Sign Tests                  |                                                |                             |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
|                                                                                                                         | Items with<br>Change More<br>Desirable | Items with Lack<br>of Change More<br>Desirable | Total<br>Number<br>of Items | Sig.<br>Level    |
| 1. Those items with significant differences between the percentage of change and no change found desirable by teachers. | 11                                     | 4                                              | 15                          | N. S. D.         |
| 2. All items with differences between the percentage of change and no change found desirable by teachers                | 45                                     | 26                                             | 71                          | .05 <sup>a</sup> |

<sup>a</sup>For a more detailed analysis of the sign tests see Table XVI, Appendix A.

The sign test on all items was significant at the .05 level. It showed that teachers found change more desirable than lack of change on forty-six of seventy-one items. However, the sign test on those items found



significant by chi square tests was not significant. Table VIII shows that the global response of teachers to the desirability of change and no change was significant at the .05 level. However, on this question, the teachers found the over-all amount of changes less desirable than lack of changes. Thus, the results of these three tests were somewhat conflicting. To some extent, the teachers in schools with insiders favored organizational changes over lack of changes. However, this tendency was not highly significant, nor was it consistent. Teachers in schools of inside successors were quite satisfied with changes instituted, and also satisfied, to a lesser extent, with the status quo situation. Table VIII shows that more than sixty per cent of the teachers always favored changes or lack of changes on all features of the school's organization.

#### Nature of Differences in Satisfaction of Change

Table VIII shows that teachers found change more satisfactory than lack of change on organizational activities associated with providing students with certain services (guidance, library service, class grouping, special instruction), and also with providing certain consultative or information services for teachers (group consultation, orientation, planned modified programs). In these areas a significant minority of teachers were quite displeased with lack of changes.

The same pattern of general satisfaction with changes rather than lack of changes was not evident in the informal organization. Table XVI of Appendix A shows that the teachers found changes less desirable than lack of changes on seven of eight items. This inclusion



TABLE VIII

ITEMIZED DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGE  
AND LACK OF CHANGE IN SCHOOLS OF INSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Item                                                                           | N  | Per Cent<br>Change<br>Desirable | N   | Per Cent<br>No Change<br>Desirable | Sig.<br>Level    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. The frequency of staff meetings                                             | 48 | 75.0                            | 116 | 92.3                               | .05 <sup>a</sup> |
| 3. Nature or extent of formal staff discussion about the instructional program | 48 | 85.3                            | 118 | 73.0                               | .05              |
| 12. Number or kind of regulations actually adhered to by teachers              | 40 | 75.0                            | 122 | 90.0                               | .05 <sup>a</sup> |
| 14. Nature of group consultation activities                                    | 30 | 86.5                            | 132 | 63.6                               | .05              |
| 15. Number of modified programs planned, developed by staff                    | 57 | 99.0                            | 104 | 67.0                               | .001             |
| 16. Method of orienting new teachers to school                                 | 30 | 100.0                           | 131 | 76.4                               | .01              |
| 27. Nature of organized sports or student activities                           | 53 | 99.0                            | 100 | 92.0                               | .05              |
| 33. Function of guidance counsellors in the school                             | 22 | 95.4                            | 126 | 57.1                               | .001             |
| 36. Method of informing parents about homework policy                          | 39 | 100.0                           | 121 | 76.0                               | .01              |
| 40. Extent of school communication with parents about special promotions       | 27 | 100.0                           | 135 | 80.0                               | .05              |





TABLE VIII (Continued)

| Item                                                                                      | N  | Per Cent<br>Change<br>Desirable | N   | Per Cent<br>No Change<br>Desirable | Sig.<br>Level    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 41. Method of grouping students<br>for instruction                                        | 33 | 90.9                            | 135 | 80.0                               | .05              |
| 43. Nature of special classes,<br>remedial instruction for<br>bright, dull students       | 28 | 92.7                            | 134 | 56.8                               | .001             |
| 54. Nature of library ser-<br>vices in school                                             | 61 | 91.8                            | 102 | 74.6                               | .01              |
| 66. The particular teachers<br>who tended to dominate<br>discussions at staff<br>meetings | 16 | 62.5                            | 140 | 85.8                               | .05 <sup>a</sup> |
| 69. Frequency with which<br>principal talks infor-<br>mally to teachers                   | 44 | 72.8                            | 120 | 88.3                               | .05 <sup>a</sup> |
| 72. The amount of change or<br>lack of change on the<br>whole organization                | 99 | 87.0                            | 62  | 98.5                               | .05 <sup>a</sup> |

<sup>a</sup>Items on which teachers found lack of change more desirable than change.

of questions on informal organization was one of the main reasons why hypothesis, three, in general, could not be rejected. Without the inclusion of these items on informal organization, there would have been a distinct tendency for teachers to favor changes over lack of changes.

#### Summary of Findings

There was insufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis three. However, there was a tendency for teachers in schools of inside successors to find changes more desirable than lack of changes. Changes were



particularly desirable and lack of changes undesirable on organizational features associated with some special services or consultation for students or teachers. In general, though, teachers were relatively content with change or lack of change, whichever had taken place.

A discussion of this hypothesis will follow the section on results of hypothesis four. At that time the differential effect of organizational change upon teachers in schools of inside and outside successors will be discussed more fully.

#### V. THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGE IN SCHOOLS OF OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

##### Findings--Test of Hypothesis Four

Null hypothesis four states that in schools of outside successors there is no significant difference between the teachers' satisfaction with changes implemented and their satisfaction with the status quo. The analysis of the extent of differences between teachers' desirability of change and no change is presented in Table IX. Both sign tests were highly significant at the .001 level. The teachers found a lack of change more satisfactory than implemented changes.

Like the teachers in schools with insiders as principals, the teachers in schools of outsiders found both change and lack of change quite desirable, whichever had occurred. Table X shows that more than sixty per cent of teachers always found change or lack of change more desirable on all features of the school's organization.



TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES AND LACK  
OF CHANGES IN SCHOOLS OF OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Type of Comparison                                                                                         | Results of Sign Tests                  |                                                |                             |                   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                                            | Items with<br>Change More<br>Desirable | Items with Lack<br>of Change<br>More Desirable | Total<br>Number<br>Of Items | Sig.<br>Level     |
| 1. Those items with significant differences between the percentage of change and no change found desirable | 2                                      | 20                                             | 22                          | .001              |
| 2. All items with differences between the percentage of change and no change found desirable by teachers   | 19                                     | 52                                             | 71                          | .001 <sup>a</sup> |

<sup>a</sup>For a more detailed analysis of the sign tests see Table XVII, Appendix A.

Nature of the Differences in Satisfaction of Change

The nature of differences between desirability of change and no change in schools of outside successors is presented in Table X. Teachers in schools of outsiders were more disturbed about organizational changes than teachers in schools of insiders. Conversely, they found a lack of organizational change more desirable than teachers in schools of inside successors. While teachers in schools of insiders were more critical of lack of change in special services for students and teachers, the teachers in schools of outsiders were more concerned about changes in those organizational activities concerning the principal's direct supervision over teachers (Table X, items 6,10,11,20,23) and his







TABLE X

ITEMIZED DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES  
AND LACK OF CHANGES IN SCHOOLS OF OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Item                                                                                                                    | N   | Per Cent<br>Change<br>Desirable | N   | Per Cent<br>No Change<br>Desirable | Sig.<br>Level |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Frequency of staff meetings                                                                                          | 78  | 78.2                            | 194 | 90.3                               | .01           |
| 6. Relationship between teacher<br>and principal during formal<br>class visit                                           | 57  | 73.8                            | 192 | 88.0                               | .05           |
| 10. Method or frequency with<br>which the principal checks<br>teachers who are late or ab-<br>sent from school or class | 30  | 70.0                            | 228 | 86.4                               | .05           |
| 11. Number or kind of regula-<br>tions teachers are expec-<br>ted to follow                                             | 106 | 71.5                            | 168 | 90.5                               | .001          |
| 18. Nature of general school<br>policy regarding use of<br>class time for parties,<br>sales, etc.                       | 45  | 76.0                            | 229 | 88.8                               | .05           |
| 20. Function of teacher in<br>supervising students out<br>of class time                                                 | 60  | 75.0                            | 216 | 90.2                               | .01           |
| 22. Function of principal in<br>administering corporal<br>punishment                                                    | 100 | 76.0                            | 166 | 89.4                               | .01           |
| 23. Function of teacher in<br>delegating discipline<br>problems to principal,<br>vice-principal, coun-<br>sellor        | 74  | 77.1                            | 189 | 91.0                               | .01           |
| 24. Nature of formal regula-<br>tions students are expected<br>to follow                                                | 92  | 75.0                            | 185 | 89.7                               | .001          |
| 29. Method of organizing,<br>controlling extra-curri-<br>cular activities                                               | 69  | 76.8                            | 183 | 87.5                               | .05           |



TABLE X (Continued)

| Item                                                                                                       | N   | Per Cent<br>Change<br>Desirable | N   | Per Cent<br>No Change<br>Desirable | Sig.<br>Level     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 31. Function of principal in directing, controlling extra-curricular activities                            | 80  | 72.5                            | 175 | 92.0                               | .001              |
| 33. Function of guidance counsellors                                                                       | 51  | 90.1                            | 186 | 74.3                               | .05 <sup>a</sup>  |
| 38. Function of principal in advising or deciding on promotion decisions                                   | 62  | 72.6                            | 198 | 89.4                               | .001              |
| 43. Nature of special instruction or classes for bright or dull students                                   | 48  | 91.7                            | 212 | 65.0                               | .001 <sup>a</sup> |
| 47. Methods or symbols used to record pupil achievement on report cards                                    | 55  | 69.2                            | 195 | 85.6                               | .01               |
| 59. Time that school classes begin or end                                                                  | 36  | 77.8                            | 235 | 90.5                               | .05               |
| 61. Method of informing parents about school activities, procedures                                        | 84  | 77.5                            | 161 | 87.6                               | .05               |
| 63. Nature of relationships between the staff and Home & School Ass'n                                      | 104 | 67.3                            | 169 | 86.0                               | .001              |
| 64. The particular teachers with whom the principal consults most frequently about administrative problems | 47  | 61.7                            | 204 | 81.0                               | .01               |
| 66. The particular teachers who dominate staff meetings                                                    | 37  | 62.1                            | 217 | 89.5                               | .001              |
| 69. Frequency with which principal talks informally with teachers                                          | 76  | 74.9                            | 185 | 87.0                               | .01               |



TABLE X (Continued)

| Item                                                                                 | Per Cent<br>Change<br>Desirable |      | Per Cent<br>No Change<br>Desirable |      | Sig.<br>Level |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|---------------|
|                                                                                      | N                               |      | N                                  |      |               |
| 70. Frequency with which teachers meet in informal groups during official class time | 91                              | 73.6 | 170                                | 85.9 | .05           |

<sup>a</sup>Items on which teachers found change more desirable than lack of change.

concern for the conduct of students in and out of official class hours (Table X, items 22,24,29,31). The teachers in schools of outsiders found informal organizational changes less desirable than lack of changes. Referring back to the results of hypothesis three, teachers in schools of insiders also found informal changes less desirable than lack of changes. Although teachers in both categories of schools disliked changes in the informal organization, teachers in schools of outsiders were relatively more annoyed with these changes. Generally, changes in the formal organization were accepted more readily than changes in the informal organization.

#### Summary of Findings

The results of the sign tests and chi square tests warranted rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the hypothesis that teachers in schools of outside successors find lack of organizational change more desirable than change. The teachers found lack of change more satisfactory and changes less satisfactory on organizational features





related to the principal's direct supervision over teachers and his supervision over the conduct and extra-curricular activities of students. In both categories of schools, the teachers were more dissatisfied with changes in the informal organization.

#### Discussion of the Findings Derived from Hypotheses Three and Four

Teachers were, generally, very content with the status quo in the organization of the school. This result follows from the theory of equilibrium forces in social organizations. The predominate tendency of members in social organizations like schools is to preserve those conditions which already exist. This drive by most teachers to preserve the status quo is not caused by some perverse desire on the part of teachers to be ultra-conservative, but is a natural human response of teachers in an organizational setting. Being satisfied with conditions as they are, they feel more secure and stable. Their satisfaction and security helps maintain the stability and consensus within the organization which, in turn, facilitates the efficient organization of the school.

The teachers' contentment with organizational change was more difficult to explain. According to the theory presented in Chapter II, changes have a disruptive effect upon the stability of organization. However, this disruptive effect of change was pronounced only when the changes struck at the main norms and values of the organization. Why were teachers generally satisfied with changes? Perhaps because these changes were not numerous or major in nature, and thus, did not seriously alter the roles, norms and sanctions of the social organization in the schools. This explanation appears plausible since changes were quite



subordinate to lack of changes in the school. Perhaps, though, the principals were so adept at introducing major changes that the teachers did not have too much opportunity to become extremely dissatisfied with them. This explanation appears less plausible than the former explanation and cannot, of course, be substantiated by the results of the study. Since changes were not numerous it can be inferred that these changes would not drastically alter the stability of the school.

However, where the percentage of change was greater, as in the case in schools of outside successors, the conservative forces became more dissatisfied. Since the conservative forces are the predominate social force in social organizations, then their reaction becomes significant. In schools of outsiders, they were particularly dissatisfied with changes in the supervision of teachers and changes in the informal organization. Likely, changes in these areas of organization would affect the status and role performance of teachers more directly than changes in organizational areas dealing with the organization and supervision of students. Unlike the insider, the outsider did not know and probably did not care as much about the consequences of change, when making changes that might offend teachers personally.

Although there was some reaction from the liberal forces in schools of outsiders to lack of changes, their reaction was overshadowed by the stronger reaction of the conservative forces to change. Also, many of the potential critics of the conditions existing under the predecessor were probably placated by the greater number of changes instituted by outsiders.



Where the lack of changes were much more numerous than changes, as in the case of inside successors, then the liberal forces became more dissatisfied. In schools with insiders as principals the predominate conservative forces were quite satisfied with the maintenance of the status quo. There was a small, but significant dissatisfaction with lack of change. This reaction from the liberals was not strong enough to reject conclusively hypothesis three. Thus, the insiders also placated some of the liberal forces and in doing so, engendered a smaller margin of dissatisfaction among the teachers in their schools as compared to the greater percentage of dissatisfied teachers in schools of outsiders. Significantly, the liberal element of teachers disliked lack of changes in special services for teachers and students and were not too concerned with lack of changes in supervision of teachers or in the informal organization. This result probably indicated that some teachers were more worried about the need for changes in those activities that could provide some service to them.

A similar explanation could account for the greater percentage of teachers disliking informal organizational changes more than formal organizational changes. Once established in a satisfactory informal group, teachers would be quite resistant to changes because they would not know or even want to predict the nature of the consequences of these changes for them personally. In schools of outsiders, this resistance to informal changes was even more pronounced because of the feeling that since the outsider was a 'foreigner,' he was more liable to disturb their personal relationships than the insider who understood the intimate







informal relationships better.

In summary, the reaction of teachers to changes instituted by outsiders and insiders was quite favorable because these changes were not extremely numerous or major ones. Likewise, the main conservative body of teachers was also happy with the status quo in the organization of schools in the sample. However, some differential reactions from both categories of schools were noted. With the outsider as principal, the teachers were less prone to accept changes in those areas of the organization in which changes might affect their role and status. With the insider as principal, most teachers readily accepted changes while there was a tendency for a few teachers to criticize some organizational areas that they felt could be changed. The insider, with his balance of change and no change, engendered less dissatisfaction than the outsider.

## VI. COMPARISON OF INSIDE AND OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS ON INSTITUTING ORGANIZATIONAL RULES

### Findings--Testing Hypothesis Five

Null hypothesis five states that there is no significant difference between inside and outside successors on instituting organizational rules. Table XI shows that none of the four items pertaining to organizational rules was significant. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

It was decided, however, to compare, in each category of schools, the frequency of teachers responding to changes in rules that students and teachers are expected to follow with the frequency of teachers



TABLE XI  
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OUTSIDE AND INSIDE SUCCESSORS  
ON INSTITUTING CHANGES IN RULES

| Item                                                                                     | N   | Insider<br>Per Cent<br>Change | N   | Outsider<br>Per Cent<br>Change | Sig.<br>Level |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 11. Number or kind of written or verbal regulations that teachers are expected to follow | 160 | 30.0                          | 274 | 38.7                           | N.S.D.        |
| 12. Number or kind of written or verbal regulations actually adhered to by teachers      | 162 | 24.7                          | 267 | 27.3                           | N.S.D.        |
| 24. Number or nature of formal regulations that students are expected to follow          | 161 | 27.9                          | 277 | 33.3                           | N.S.D.        |
| 25. Number or nature of regulations actually followed by students                        | 158 | 28.9                          | 269 | 36.5                           | N.S.D.        |

responding to changes in the number of teachers actually following rules. Table XII shows the results of this comparison. The only significant comparison was in the schools of outside successors. Here, the teachers saw more changes in the rules teachers were expected to follow than changes in the number of teachers following rules. This item was significant at the .001 level and revealed that the teachers in schools of outsiders felt that changes in rules were more numerous than any corresponding changes in the number of teachers expected to follow rules.



TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN RULES TEACHERS ARE EXPECTED TO FOLLOW WITH  
CHANGES IN NUMBER OF TEACHERS ACTUALLY FOLLOWING RULES

| Type of Principal | Per Cent Change in<br>Rules Expected to |        | Per Cent Change<br>in Teachers Fol- |              | Sig.<br>Level |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
|                   | N                                       | Follow | N                                   | lowing Rules |               |
| Outside successor | 274                                     | 40.5   | 267                                 | 27.3         | .001          |
| Inside successor  | 160                                     | 20.0   | 162                                 | 24.7         | N.S.D.        |

VII. COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES IN  
ORGANIZATIONAL RULES IN BOTH CATEGORIES OF SCHOOLS

Findings--Testing Hypothesis Six

Null hypothesis six states that there is no significant difference between teachers in schools of inside and outside successors in their satisfaction with changes in organizational rules. Table XIII shows that there were no significant items pertaining to this hypothesis. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

VIII. THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES IN ORGANIZATIONAL  
RULES IN SCHOOLS OF OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

Findings

Previously no hypothesis had been formulated for this comparison. Essentially, the teachers' satisfaction with change and lack of change in organizational rules they were supposed to follow is being compared. Table XIV shows that teachers in schools of outsiders found changes in





TABLE XIII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES IN  
RULES AND THE TYPE OF PRINCIPAL SUCCESSOR

| Item                                                                                     | Inside Successors |                       | Outside Successors |                       | Sig.<br>Level |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                          | N                 | % Change<br>Desirable | N                  | % Change<br>Desirable |               |
| 11. Number or kind of written or verbal regulations that teachers are expected to follow | 48                | 81.3                  | 106                | 71.5                  | N. S. D.      |
| 12. Number or kind of written or verbal regulations actually adhered to by teachers      | 40                | 75.0                  | 73                 | 85.0                  | N. S. D.      |
| 24. Number or nature of formal regulations that students are expected to follow          | 45                | 86.8                  | 92                 | 75.0                  | N. S. D.      |
| 25. Number or nature of regulations actually followed by students                        | 46                | 86.9                  | 98                 | 85.8                  | N. S. D.      |

TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF THE TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHANGES AND  
LACK OF CHANGES IN RULES IN SCHOOLS OF OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Item                                                            | Per Cent<br>Change |           | Per Cent<br>No Change |           | Sig.<br>Level |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|
|                                                                 | N                  | Desirable | N                     | Desirable |               |
| 11. Number of formal rules that teachers are expected to follow | 106                | 71.5      | 168                   | 90.5      | .001          |
| 24. Number of formal rules that students are expected to follow | 92                 | 75.0      | 185                   | 89.7      | .001          |



organizational rules that students and teachers are expected to follow significantly less satisfactory than lack of changes. This difference in the teachers' reaction to change and lack of change in organizational rules did not occur in the schools of insiders. Nor did the teachers find changes in the number of teachers following rules less desirable than lack of changes.

### Discussion

Although null hypotheses five and six were accepted, some significant differences between outsiders and insiders were found. The teachers in schools of outsiders found changes in rules they were supposed to follow less satisfactory than lack of changes while this same comparison in schools of insiders did not yield any significant differences. Combined with the result from hypothesis four, that teachers in schools of outsiders found changes in the direct supervision of teachers less satisfactory than lack of changes, this result demonstrates a tendency for teachers in schools of outsiders to become more annoyed with changes in bureaucratic procedures (rule-making and direct supervision). These changes in bureaucratic rules also were not effective in acquiring the compliance of teachers in schools of outsiders. In schools of insiders there was no divergence between changes in verbal rules they were expected to follow and the number of teachers actually following rules.

Although this study did not show conclusively that outsiders instituted bureaucratic rules which teachers disliked more and also did not follow as much, this study did demonstrate some tendencies for this



relationship to exist. As pointed out in Chapter II, this relationship between outsiders and bureaucratic procedures follows from the position in which the outsider is placed. Although all newcomers make new rules to demonstrate the way they will structure the organization, outsiders become more possessed by rule-making because they have no social link with the teachers, and thus, no channels to direct changes. Rules for outsiders were a substitute for a more personal involvement in the organizational situation. Until they knew the teachers better they had to structure the organization by resorting to bureaucratic methods. This study has demonstrated that outsiders, typically, would be more concerned with instituting changes in an effort to structure the organization as they see it. Insiders, however, had informal channels with which to institute changes. They also knew what rules to change and which way to change them. Their rule changes would normally be more accepted by teachers. In summary, the results of this study revealed some tendencies for outsiders to have a greater inclination to change bureaucratic procedures and some slight tendencies for teachers in a school of outsiders to resent this approach more than teachers in schools of insiders.





## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I. SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH DESIGN

##### The Problem

This study has analyzed the differences between outside and inside successors to the principalship on instituting organizational change in schools. It has also analyzed the differences between teachers in schools of outside and inside successors in their satisfaction with organizational changes instituted by both types of successors.

##### Hypotheses

The basic hypotheses involved in this study were: (1) that outside successors institute more organizational changes than inside successors; (2) that outside successors with no experience in the school system institute more changes than outside successors with some experience in the school system; (3) that teachers in schools of inside successors find implemented changes more satisfactory than lack of changes; (4) that teachers in schools of outside successors find implemented changes less satisfactory than lack of changes; (5) that outsiders institute more changes in organizational rules than insiders; (6) that teachers in schools of outsiders find implemented changes in organizational rules more satisfactory than teachers in schools of insiders.



### Sample

The sample consisted of 452 completed questionnaires from 104 public and separate schools in Alberta. The teachers in these schools had taught under two different principals sometime during the years 1961 to 1964, inclusive. Although six questionnaires were sent to each school, they were not all returned. The total sample was split into two categories. One category represented all those teachers who were in schools of inside successors, while the other category represented all those teachers who were in schools of outside successors. The responses from individual teachers were, then, connected with the type of principal in the school. The two categories of principals were fairly equivalent on the basis of age, previous administrative experience and previous teaching experience. They differed somewhat on the amount of university training and the amount of previous experience within the system. Outsiders had more university training and did not have as much experience in the school system. The teachers in each category were quite equivalent on the basis of age, experience and training.

The number of respondents per school was quite similar. There was an average of 4.2 teachers in schools of insiders and 4.4 teachers in schools of outsiders responding to the questionnaire.

### Instrumentation

A questionnaire, which elicited responses of yes or no to questions about change on selected features of the schools' organization, was developed. This questionnaire also contained a personal data sheet for teachers. Although principals did not respond to the



questionnaire, they did complete a personal data sheet.

#### Method of Collecting and Analyzing the Data

The data was collected by sending out packets containing six questionnaires, a principal's information sheet and a return packet to any schools in which there had been a change of principals during the years 1961 to 1964. As many teachers as possible (up to six) were asked to respond to the questionnaire.

The results from the questionnaires were scored and recorded on IBM cards. Every teacher's responses were linked with the type of principal in the school in which they had taught.

For each item on the questionnaire and for each type of principal successor the total number of teachers responding to change and no change was tabulated. These four sets of figures were, then, cast into 2x2 chi square tables to determine if the number of teachers checking change and no change in schools of insiders was significantly different from the number of teachers checking change and no change in schools of outsiders. This same procedure for all items on the questionnaire was carried out in testing the other hypotheses. The results of these chi square tests showed those items on which there were significant differences between insiders and outsiders.

To determine the over-all extent of change, the pair of figures pertaining to change and no change on each question were converted into a percentage of the number of teachers responding to change. For each item, these two percentages for insiders and outsiders were compared. A plus sign was assigned to those items on which insiders had instituted





a greater percentage of change and a minus sign to those items on which outsiders had instituted a greater percentage of change. A sign test determined if the total number of plus and minus signs were significantly different. If they were, then the hypothesis was rejected. The same procedure was followed in testing the other hypotheses.

## II. RESULTS

Since the results were centered around the testing of hypotheses, they will be summarized under each hypothesis.

### Hypothesis One

Null hypothesis one was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. Outsiders instituted more changes in organizational areas related to student supervision, communication channels with parents, and extra-curricular activities. Compared to insiders they did not institute any more changes on those features related directly to the supervision of teachers and the informal organization. Like insiders, they were probably more worried about the consequences of changes that directly affect the personal role and status of teachers.

Since change was less frequent than lack of change in both types of schools, then it was inferred that neither type of successor disturbed the stability of the school very much.

### Hypothesis Two

Null hypothesis two was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. Outsiders with no previous experience in the school system



instituted more organizational change than outsiders with some previous experience in the school system on those features of the organization related to student supervision and organization, especially in extra-curricular activities.

The results of this hypothesis added some support to the theory that principals who move from one school system to another are more cosmopolitan in their approach to school administration. Unlike principals who remain with a school system, the outsiders to the system were less constrained by local customs, policies and regulations, and more likely to institute greater changes in the schools.

### Hypothesis Three

Null hypothesis three was accepted. Although the research hypothesis was not accepted there was a marked tendency for teachers in schools of insiders to be more critical of lack of changes than of changes. A small minority of teachers were dissatisfied with the status quo in organizational areas associated with providing students and teachers with certain types of services (libraries, special instruction), and with providing consultation and orientation programs for teachers. The teachers were not dissatisfied with lack of change in the informal organization, but were significantly disturbed by changes in this area.

With their program of change, the insiders satisfied most of the conservative elements in their schools. They were also quite successful in placating most of the liberal forces.



#### Hypothesis Four

Null hypothesis four was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. The teachers in schools of outsiders were particularly annoyed with changes in the principal's direct supervision of teachers and students, and with changes in the informal organization of the school.

In accepting null hypothesis three and in rejecting null hypothesis four, the results of this study indicated that the outsiders engendered a greater margin of dissatisfaction with their program of change than the insiders. Although most liberal elements were satisfied by the number and kind of changes instituted by the outsiders, the larger number of conservative forces were not.

#### Hypothesis Five

Null hypothesis five was accepted. However, in schools of outsiders the teachers saw more changes in the rules teachers were expected to follow than changes in the number of teachers actually following the rules. This relationship did not exist in schools of insiders. Apparently, rules did not receive the complete acceptance of teachers in schools of outsiders. Some of the teachers did not obey and carry out the rules.

#### Hypothesis Six

Null hypothesis six was accepted. There was some difference in the desirability of changes in organizational rules. Teachers in schools of outsiders found changes in rules that students and teachers are expected to follow less desirable than lack of changes. This





relationship did not exist in schools of insiders, nor did it hold true for the desirability of changes in the number of students or teachers actually following rules.

The results of hypotheses five and six did not conclusively show that there was any difference between insiders and outsiders in instituting organizational change on rules, or that there was any difference between the teachers in schools of outsiders and insiders in their desirability of changes in organizational rules. Two relationships did occur, though. Teachers in schools of outsiders were more dissatisfied with changes in rules they were expected to follow and they were less likely to comply with changes in rules.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

The major conclusions of this study were that:

1. Outsiders instituted more change than insiders in organizational areas related to the supervision and control of student activities and programs.
2. Teachers in both categories of schools reported lack of change more often than change in the organization of the school.
3. Outsiders with no previous experience in the school system instituted more change than outsiders with some experience in the school system on organizational areas related to the supervision of student extra-curricular activities.
4. Teachers in schools of outsiders found changes in the supervision of teachers and students and changes in the informal organization



less satisfactory than lack of changes.

5. Teachers in schools of insiders found changes in the informal organization less satisfactory than lack of changes. There was a tendency, which was not conclusive, for teachers in schools of insiders to find changes in the formal organization more satisfactory than lack of changes.

6. Teachers, in general, accepted both changes and lack of changes. On every feature of the organization, there were more teachers who were satisfied with present organizational features, and also, more teachers satisfied with changes on organizational features, than there were teachers who were dissatisfied with changes and lack of changes.

7. Teachers in schools of outsiders found organizational changes in rules they were expected to follow less satisfactory than lack of changes. They were also less willing to comply with rules the outsiders instituted.

#### IV. IMPLICATIONS

The principals in this study felt that a stable organization was a necessary requirement for effective teaching and learning conditions. Even though the principals were new in their positions in the schools, the amount of change they instituted was not very extensive. Not knowing what changes to make and how these changes would affect teachers, parents and students, the new principals were cautious in introducing change. Certainly, there was some wisdom in this approach.



As a group, they did not meet any major opposition from the teachers. Most of their changes were accepted. Various reasons could account for this general acceptance of change. The relative stability in the schools, the minor nature of changes, and the careful manner of instituting changes could be some reasons.

One implication of these results is that the principals, on the whole, could certainly have instituted more changes and not incurred much more dissatisfaction from the staff. However, they would find some opposition from the teachers if they instituted too many changes in the direct supervision of teachers and in the informal organization in the school. These two areas appeared to be more sensitive to change, probably because changes here would affect the personal role and status of teachers more than changes in other areas of organization. Apparently, when instituting changes, principals would be wiser to change features of the organization that affect teachers indirectly. If teachers do not feel that the consequences of change seriously disturb their role and status, they likely would accept changes.

The results of this study show that the teachers were not extremely critical about changes in the formal organization. But, they were also very satisfied with the present conditions in the school. Unless principals feel restricted by Department of Education and school board rules and regulations, they probably could introduce more sweeping changes in school organizations without disturbing the apparent contentment of teachers very much.

Although the teachers were generally content with the actions of







principals in their schools, both types of successors did not have the same success in introducing changes, and in having these changes accepted.

The major difficulty facing the insiders was their relative inability to institute very many changes. Those changes that were instituted were found very desirable by teachers. Their knowledge of the past situation, their knowledge of feed-back processes, and their ability to use informal channels to introduce changes were some of the major reasons why their changes were accepted. A small number of changes kept the staff happy and the organization quite stable and content. Some rebels were dissatisfied, but they were a decided minority.

The outsiders, especially those successors who came from outside the system, had less difficulty in instituting changes. Their major problem was in keeping the teachers satisfied with their changes. In some cases the outsiders may have instituted changes out of sheer ignorance about past conditions and a superficial understanding of the social and personal desires of the teachers. In other cases, the outsiders had to resort to some types of bureaucratic techniques to institute changes because they were not too familiar with informal channels. Changes instituted under these conditions probably did annoy many teachers.

Thus, if changes are desired in a school, insiders are a poor choice of successors. Outsiders would be better for effecting change, especially successors from outside the system. However, some of the



teachers would tend to become dissatisfied with these changes. One advantage of promoting an insider would be that the staff, as a whole, probably would remain more content. However, this contentment might only hide certain dysfunctions within the organization that could eventually cause serious problems. The results of this study, though, indicated that the outsiders did not engender serious opposition from teachers. It might be tentatively concluded that their program of change would not disrupt the organization of schools too much.

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The whole area of organizational change and leadership succession is bound up with general sociological research on small groups, bureaucracies, and large organizations. To understand properly the nature of change it is, perhaps, necessary to understand the nature of current theory and research in social organizations. Further research in this area must also be concerned with further sociological and, to some extent, psychological research into the nature of organizations and their effects upon individuals. Because the case study centers upon one unique social situation and thus is able to demonstrate with more precision the nature, direction, and consequences of organizational change, then it might be more useful as a research procedure for studying social organizations and change processes.

Some specific research problems occurred to the writer. Stated in the form of questions, they were:

1. What is the relationship between loyalty to the school system



and professional orientation in administration?

2. What is the relationship between the nature and extent of organizational change and the degree of professional training in administration?

3. What is the effect of organizational change in the school upon other reference groups such as students, parents, supervisors and superintendents?

4. What is the effect of sustained and radical change upon the stability of the school's organization?

5. What is the relationship between principal succession and informal groups within the school?

6. What is the relationship between principal succession and bureaucratic tendencies in the organization of the school?

7. What is the effect of organizational changes instituted by the Department of Education, school board officials and supervisors upon principals and teachers within the school? How are these changes accepted?

8. What is the relationship between the length of a principal's incumbency in one school and organizational change?

9. What is the relationship between cohesive work groups and organizational change in the school?





## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Richard W. Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Carlson, Richard O. Executive Succession and Organizational Change. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1962.
- Dixon, Wilfred J., and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction to Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.
- Greer, Scott A. Social Organization. New York: Random House, 1955.
- Guest, Robert M. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorey Press, Inc., and W. Irwin, Inc., 1962.
- Jenson, Gale and Max R. Goodson. Formal Organizations in School Systems. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1956.
- Lawrence, Paul R. The Changing of Organizational Behaviour Patterns: A Case Study of Decentralization. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1958.
- Lippitt, Ronald, Jeanne Watson and Bruce Westley. The Dynamics of Planned Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958.
- Litterer, Joseph A. Organization: Structure and Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.



Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Whyte, William H., Jr. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

## B. PERIODICALS

Coch, Lester and John R. P. French, Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change," Human Relations, I (January, 1948), 512-532.

Cunningham, Luvern J. "Effecting Organizational Change," Organization: A Means to Improved Instruction, The 1962 Alberta Principals' Leadership Course (July, 1962), 104-129.

Downey, Lawrence W. "Direction Amid Change," Phi Delta Kappan, XLII No. 5 (February, 1961), 186-191.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Organizational Theory as a Guide to Educational Change," Educational Theory, XI, No. 1 (January, 1961), 38-44.

Seeman, Melvin. "Social Mobility and Administrative Behaviour," American Sociological Review, XXIII (September, 1958), 633-642.

Selznick, Philip. "Foundations of the Theory of Organization," American Sociological Review, XIII (February, 1948), 25-35.

## C. ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Dubin, Robert. "Stability of Human Organizations," Modern Organizational Theory, Mason Haire, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959, 218-253.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals," Organizations: Structure and Behavior, Joseph A. Litterer, editor. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1963, 357-362.

Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised edition. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957, 195-206.





## APPENDIX A

### SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

1. Results of Responses on Organizational Change for both Categories of Successors (Table XV).
2. Results of Responses on Desirability of Change and No Change in Schools of Inside Successors (Table XVI).
3. Results of Responses on Desirability of Change and No Change in Schools of Outside Successors (Table XVII).
4. Results of Responses on Organizational Change for Outside Successors with No and Some Previous Experience in the School System (Table XVIII).



TABLE XV

RESULTS OF RESPONSES ON ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE FOR BOTH  
CATEGORIES OF SUCCESSORS

| Item | A<br>Insiders |                    | B<br>Outsiders |                    | Sign of<br>A - B |
|------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|
|      | N             | Per Cent<br>Change | N              | Per Cent<br>Change |                  |
| 1    | 164           | 29.2               | 272            | 28.7               | +                |
| 2    | 164           | 28.1               | 273            | 33.7               | -                |
| 3    | 165           | 28.4               | 267            | 37.1               | -                |
| 4    | 163           | 22.0               | 270            | 24.4               | -                |
| 5    | 158           | 16.4               | 277            | 28.9               | -                |
| 6    | 142           | 16.4               | 249            | 22.9               | -                |
| 7    | 153           | 22.9               | 263            | 24.3               | -                |
| 8    | 158           | 39.8               | 270            | 38.5               | +                |
| 9    | 157           | 24.2               | 269            | 31.6               | -                |
| 10   | 161           | 11.1               | 258            | 11.7               | -                |
| 11   | 160           | 30.0               | 274            | 38.7               | -                |
| 12   | 162           | 24.7               | 267            | 27.3               | -                |
| 13   | 161           | 20.5               | 272            | 34.5               | -                |
| 14   | 162           | 18.5               | 257            | 22.2               | -                |
| 15   | 161           | 35.4               | 263            | 39.3               | -                |
| 16   | 161           | 18.6               | 263            | 17.2               | +                |
| 17   | 165           | 20.0               | 272            | 23.9               | -                |
| 18   | 164           | 14.0               | 273            | 16.4               | -                |
| 19   | 159           | 38.9               | 276            | 44.2               | -                |
| 20   | 162           | 23.4               | 276            | 21.8               | +                |
| 21   | 165           | 19.8               | 278            | 22.0               | -                |
| 22   | 162           | 22.2               | 266            | 37.5               | -                |
| 23   | 159           | 19.5               | 259            | 28.6               | -                |
| 24   | 161           | 27.9               | 277            | 33.3               | -                |
| 25   | 159           | 28.9               | 269            | 36.5               | -                |
| 26   | 159           | 28.2               | 273            | 33.7               | -                |
| 27   | 153           | 34.6               | 259            | 24.4               | +                |
| 28   | 144           | 26.3               | 251            | 36.4               | -                |
| 29   | 159           | 27.6               | 252            | 31.0               | -                |
| 30   | 158           | 19.0               | 255            | 18.8               | +                |
| 31   | 156           | 21.8               | 255            | 34.0               | -                |
| 32   | 153           | 17.6               | 246            | 19.5               | -                |
| 33   | 160           | 12.9               | 237            | 21.7               | -                |
| 34   | 163           | 14.1               | 253            | 18.6               | -                |
| 35   | 159           | 20.5               | 250            | 26.0               | -                |
| 36   | 166           | 23.4               | 248            | 26.6               | -                |
| 37   | 161           | 11.8               | 261            | 20.3               | -                |



TABLE XV (Continued)

| Item                       | N   | A-Per Cent<br>Change | N   | B-Per Cent<br>Change | Sign of<br>A - B |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|------------------|
| 38                         | 159 | 14.5                 | 260 | 24.9                 | -                |
| 39                         | 163 | 15.3                 | 263 | 21.7                 | -                |
| 40                         | 162 | 16.7                 | 268 | 22.4                 | -                |
| 41                         | 157 | 21.0                 | 257 | 23.3                 | -                |
| 42                         | 160 | 18.7                 | 263 | 23.6                 | -                |
| 43                         | 162 | 17.3                 | 260 | 18.4                 | -                |
| 44                         | 164 | 13.4                 | 272 | 13.9                 | -                |
| 45                         | 158 | 7.6                  | 275 | 13.8                 | -                |
| 46                         | 158 | 15.8                 | 271 | 24.7                 | -                |
| 47                         | 164 | 13.4                 | 271 | 18.4                 | -                |
| 48                         | 160 | 8.7                  | 270 | 27.8                 | -                |
| 49                         | 166 | 9.5                  | 271 | 13.4                 | -                |
| 50                         | 164 | 7.3                  | 272 | 12.5                 | -                |
| 51                         | 163 | 20.8                 | 272 | 31.3                 | -                |
| 52                         | 160 | 15.0                 | 264 | 26.1                 | -                |
| 53                         | 163 | 13.5                 | 269 | 22.0                 | -                |
| 54                         | 163 | 37.4                 | 273 | 32.6                 | +                |
| 55                         | 163 | 21.4                 | 270 | 30.7                 | -                |
| 56                         | 164 | 18.9                 | 271 | 30.2                 | -                |
| 57                         | 165 | 14.5                 | 272 | 22.0                 | -                |
| 58                         | 141 | 14.2                 | 268 | 17.6                 | -                |
| 59                         | 160 | 22.5                 | 271 | 13.3                 | +                |
| 60                         | 131 | 26.7                 | 241 | 35.2                 | -                |
| 61                         | 159 | 14.5                 | 245 | 34.3                 | -                |
| 62                         | 161 | 29.1                 | 274 | 22.2                 | +                |
| 63                         | 156 | 13.5                 | 273 | 37.1                 | -                |
| 64                         | 153 | 24.8                 | 251 | 18.7                 | +                |
| 65                         | 149 | 10.7                 | 265 | 25.3                 | -                |
| 66                         | 156 | 10.3                 | 254 | 14.6                 | -                |
| 67                         | 162 | 24.0                 | 259 | 17.0                 | +                |
| 68                         | 157 | 23.6                 | 269 | 23.8                 | -                |
| 69                         | 164 | 26.8                 | 261 | 29.5                 | -                |
| 70                         | 158 | 9.5                  | 261 | 34.9                 | -                |
| 71                         | 158 | 28.5                 | 239 | 9.6                  | +                |
| Total number of plus signs |     |                      |     |                      | 12               |





TABLE XVI

RESULTS OF RESPONSES ON DESIRABILITY OF CHANGE AND NO CHANGE IN  
IN SCHOOLS OF INSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Item | A - Change |                       | B - No Change |                       | Sign of<br>A - B |
|------|------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|      | N          | Per Cent<br>Desirable | N             | Per Cent<br>Desirable |                  |
| 1    | 48         | 75.0                  | 116           | 92.3                  | -                |
| 2    | 46         | 84.9                  | 118           | 89.8                  | -                |
| 3    | 48         | 85.3                  | 118           | 73.0                  | +                |
| 4    | 36         | 83.4                  | 127           | 88.2                  | -                |
| 5    | 26         | 69.4                  | 132           | 81.9                  | -                |
| 6    | 23         | 93.9                  | 119           | 79.8                  | +                |
| 7    | 35         | 65.8                  | 118           | 78.0                  | -                |
| 8    | 63         | 82.6                  | 95            | 71.6                  | +                |
| 9    | 38         | 86.8                  | 119           | 83.9                  | +                |
| 10   | 18         | 94.5                  | 143           | 87.4                  | +                |
| 11   | 48         | 81.3                  | 112           | 88.5                  | -                |
| 12   | 40         | 75.0                  | 122           | 90.0                  | -                |
| 13   | 34         | 91.2                  | 128           | 78.9                  | +                |
| 14   | 30         | 86.5                  | 132           | 63.6                  | +                |
| 15   | 57         | 99.0                  | 104           | 67.0                  | +                |
| 16   | 30         | 100.0                 | 131           | 76.4                  | +                |
| 17   | 33         | 97.0                  | 132           | 84.1                  | +                |
| 18   | 23         | 87.0                  | 141           | 86.7                  | +                |
| 19   | 62         | 87.1                  | 97            | 88.7                  | -                |
| 20   | 38         | 82.6                  | 124           | 90.3                  | -                |
| 21   | 32         | 90.6                  | 132           | 89.4                  | +                |
| 22   | 36         | 80.5                  | 126           | 84.1                  | -                |
| 23   | 31         | 87.1                  | 126           | 82.8                  | +                |
| 24   | 45         | 86.8                  | 116           | 88.9                  | -                |
| 25   | 46         | 86.9                  | 113           | 85.8                  | +                |
| 26   | 45         | 86.7                  | 114           | 82.4                  | +                |
| 27   | 53         | 99.0                  | 100           | 92.0                  | +                |
| 28   | 33         | 81.6                  | 116           | 82.0                  | -                |
| 29   | 44         | 93.2                  | 115           | 80.8                  | +                |
| 30   | 30         | 93.4                  | 128           | 82.0                  | +                |
| 31   | 34         | 91.3                  | 122           | 87.8                  | +                |
| 32   | 37         | 65.0                  | 126           | 77.7                  | -                |
| 33   | 22         | 95.4                  | 126           | 57.1                  | +                |
| 34   | 23         | 78.4                  | 140           | 72.1                  | +                |
| 35   | 32         | 93.7                  | 127           | 78.0                  | +                |
| 36   | 39         | 100.0                 | 121           | 76.0                  | +                |
| 37   | 19         | 89.5                  | 142           | 79.5                  | +                |
| 38   | 23         | 86.9                  | 136           | 89.0                  | -                |



TABLE XVI (Continued)

| Item                        | A-Change |                       | B-No Change |                       | Sign of<br>A - B |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|                             | N        | Per Cent<br>Desirable | N           | Per Cent<br>Desirable |                  |
| 39                          | 25       | 87.8                  | 138         | 78.2                  | +                |
| 40                          | 27       | 100.0                 | 135         | 80.0                  | +                |
| 41                          | 33       | 90.9                  | 135         | 80.0                  | +                |
| 42                          | 30       | 83.4                  | 130         | 83.7                  | -                |
| 43                          | 28       | 92.7                  | 134         | 56.8                  | +                |
| 44                          | 22       | 90.9                  | 142         | 74.6                  | +                |
| 45                          | 12       | 83.5                  | 146         | 82.2                  | +                |
| 46                          | 25       | 92.0                  | 133         | 76.7                  | +                |
| 47                          | 22       | 86.4                  | 142         | 85.5                  | +                |
| 48                          | 14       | 78.6                  | 146         | 85.7                  | -                |
| 49                          | 15       | 93.3                  | 151         | 86.1                  | +                |
| 50                          | 12       | 100.0                 | 152         | 83.0                  | +                |
| 51                          | 35       | 88.6                  | 129         | 85.5                  | +                |
| 52                          | 35       | 97.1                  | 136         | 91.2                  | +                |
| 53                          | 22       | 81.6                  | 141         | 83.0                  | -                |
| 54                          | 61       | 91.8                  | 102         | 74.6                  | +                |
| 55                          | 35       | 97.1                  | 128         | 86.8                  | +                |
| 56                          | 31       | 93.5                  | 133         | 84.1                  | +                |
| 57                          | 24       | 100.0                 | 141         | 88.0                  | +                |
| 58                          | 20       | 95.0                  | 141         | 85.8                  | +                |
| 59                          | 36       | 80.6                  | 124         | 88.7                  | -                |
| 60                          | 35       | 85.8                  | 98          | 80.7                  | +                |
| 61                          | 23       | 100.0                 | 136         | 88.2                  | +                |
| 62                          | 47       | 82.9                  | 117         | 81.9                  | +                |
| 63                          | 21       | 76.2                  | 135         | 81.6                  | -                |
| 64                          | 38       | 89.5                  | 115         | 88.7                  | +                |
| 65                          | 16       | 75.0                  | 133         | 90.4                  | -                |
| 66                          | 16       | 62.5                  | 140         | 85.8                  | -                |
| 67                          | 39       | 82.0                  | 123         | 87.9                  | -                |
| 68                          | 39       | 79.5                  | 118         | 91.6                  | -                |
| 69                          | 44       | 72.8                  | 120         | 88.3                  | -                |
| 70                          | 15       | 75.0                  | 143         | 91.6                  | -                |
| 71                          | 45       | 84.3                  | 113         | 88.4                  | -                |
| Total Number of Minus Signs |          |                       |             |                       | 26               |



TABLE XVII

RESULTS OF RESPONSES ON DESIRABILITY OF CHANGE AND NO CHANGE  
IN SCHOOLS OF OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS

| Item | A-Change |                       | B-No Change |                       | Sign of<br>A - B |
|------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|      | N        | Per Cent<br>Desirable | N           | Per Cent<br>Desirable |                  |
| 1    | 78       | 78.2                  | 194         | 90.3                  | -                |
| 2    | 92       | 82.6                  | 181         | 88.4                  | -                |
| 3    | 99       | 82.8                  | 164         | 80.5                  | +                |
| 4    | 66       | 84.8                  | 204         | 86.3                  | -                |
| 5    | 80       | 75.1                  | 207         | 75.4                  | -                |
| 6    | 57       | 73.8                  | 192         | 88.0                  | -                |
| 7    | 64       | 70.2                  | 199         | 80.9                  | -                |
| 8    | 104      | 83.6                  | 166         | 81.4                  | +                |
| 9    | 85       | 74.0                  | 184         | 83.7                  | -                |
| 10   | 30       | 70.0                  | 228         | 86.4                  | -                |
| 11   | 106      | 71.5                  | 168         | 90.5                  | -                |
| 12   | 73       | 85.0                  | 194         | 86.5                  | -                |
| 13   | 95       | 84.3                  | 179         | 85.0                  | -                |
| 14   | 57       | 87.6                  | 200         | 78.0                  | +                |
| 15   | 77       | 86.0                  | 186         | 77.0                  | +                |
| 16   | 45       | 80.0                  | 218         | 77.2                  | +                |
| 17   | 65       | 86.3                  | 207         | 88.0                  | -                |
| 18   | 45       | 76.0                  | 229         | 88.8                  | -                |
| 19   | 122      | 70.5                  | 154         | 86.5                  | -                |
| 20   | 60       | 75.0                  | 216         | 90.2                  | -                |
| 21   | 61       | 78.7                  | 217         | 88.4                  | -                |
| 22   | 100      | 76.0                  | 166         | 89.4                  | -                |
| 23   | 74       | 77.1                  | 189         | 91.0                  | -                |
| 24   | 92       | 75.0                  | 185         | 89.7                  | -                |
| 25   | 98       | 85.8                  | 171         | 80.0                  | +                |
| 26   | 92       | 79.4                  | 181         | 88.0                  | -                |
| 27   | 83       | 85.6                  | 176         | 87.5                  | -                |
| 28   | 66       | 75.7                  | 185         | 82.2                  | -                |
| 29   | 69       | 76.8                  | 183         | 87.5                  | -                |
| 30   | 48       | 85.5                  | 207         | 86.5                  | -                |
| 31   | 80       | 72.5                  | 175         | 92.0                  | -                |
| 32   | 48       | 75.0                  | 198         | 82.8                  | -                |
| 33   | 51       | 90.1                  | 186         | 74.3                  | +                |
| 34   | 47       | 85.0                  | 206         | 83.5                  | +                |
| 35   | 65       | 84.6                  | 185         | 82.1                  | +                |
| 36   | 66       | 92.5                  | 182         | 83.5                  | +                |
| 37   | 53       | 83.0                  | 208         | 86.6                  | -                |
| 38   | 62       | 72.6                  | 198         | 89.4                  | -                |
| 39   | 57       | 77.2                  | 206         | 83.0                  | -                |





TABLE XVII (Continued)

| Item                       | A-Change |                       | B-No Change |                       | Sign of<br>A - B |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|                            | N        | Per Cent<br>Desirable | N           | Per Cent<br>Desirable |                  |
| 40                         | 60       | 91.8                  | 208         | 87.0                  | +                |
| 41                         | 60       | 83.5                  | 197         | 79.2                  | +                |
| 42                         | 62       | 71.0                  | 203         | 81.5                  | -                |
| 43                         | 48       | 91.7                  | 212         | 65.0                  | +                |
| 44                         | 38       | 86.8                  | 234         | 82.9                  | +                |
| 45                         | 38       | 81.5                  | 231         | 85.7                  | -                |
| 46                         | 65       | 81.6                  | 204         | 80.8                  | +                |
| 47                         | 55       | 69.2                  | 195         | 85.6                  | -                |
| 48                         | 75       | 77.3                  | 195         | 85.6                  | -                |
| 49                         | 36       | 91.6                  | 235         | 88.8                  | +                |
| 50                         | 34       | 85.2                  | 238         | 86.9                  | -                |
| 51                         | 85       | 80.0                  | 187         | 87.0                  | -                |
| 52                         | 69       | 79.6                  | 195         | 89.8                  | -                |
| 53                         | 54       | 85.2                  | 214         | 85.6                  | -                |
| 54                         | 89       | 83.2                  | 184         | 78.7                  | +                |
| 55                         | 83       | 82.0                  | 185         | 87.0                  | -                |
| 56                         | 82       | 86.8                  | 189         | 87.2                  | -                |
| 57                         | 60       | 88.3                  | 212         | 87.3                  | +                |
| 58                         | 47       | 70.5                  | 221         | 81.6                  | -                |
| 59                         | 36       | 77.8                  | 235         | 90.5                  | -                |
| 60                         | 85       | 77.7                  | 156         | 87.3                  | -                |
| 61                         | 84       | 77.5                  | 161         | 87.6                  | -                |
| 62                         | 61       | 90.3                  | 213         | 87.0                  | +                |
| 63                         | 104      | 67.3                  | 169         | 86.0                  | -                |
| 64                         | 47       | 61.7                  | 204         | 81.0                  | -                |
| 65                         | 67       | 80.5                  | 198         | 88.5                  | -                |
| 66                         | 37       | 62.1                  | 217         | 89.5                  | -                |
| 67                         | 44       | 70.5                  | 215         | 80.0                  | -                |
| 68                         | 64       | 78.1                  | 205         | 84.0                  | -                |
| 69                         | 76       | 74.9                  | 185         | 87.0                  | -                |
| 70                         | 91       | 73.6                  | 170         | 85.9                  | -                |
| 71                         | 23       | 82.5                  | 236         | 91.1                  | -                |
| Total number of plus signs |          |                       |             |                       | 19               |



TABLE XVIII

RESULTS OF RESPONSES ON ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE FOR OUTSIDE SUCCESSORS  
WITH NO AND SOME PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

| Item | A-Outsiders--No Experience |                    | B-Outsiders--Some Experience |                    | Sign of<br>A - B |
|------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
|      | N                          | Per Cent<br>Change | N                            | Per Cent<br>Change |                  |
| 1    | 94                         | 32.0               | 165                          | 28.5               | +                |
| 2    | 93                         | 28.0               | 179                          | 35.7               | -                |
| 3    | 92                         | 32.7               | 174                          | 27.0               | +                |
| 4    | 95                         | 20.6               | 173                          | 20.8               | -                |
| 5    | 97                         | 20.6               | 177                          | 31.6               | -                |
| 6    | 83                         | 28.9               | 165                          | 19.8               | +                |
| 7    | 87                         | 27.6               | 180                          | 20.5               | +                |
| 8    | 95                         | 42.0               | 172                          | 36.8               | +                |
| 9    | 95                         | 32.6               | 171                          | 31.6               | +                |
| 10   | 87                         | 12.6               | 171                          | 11.1               | +                |
| 11   | 97                         | 46.4               | 175                          | 34.2               | +                |
| 12   | 91                         | 33.0               | 174                          | 24.1               | +                |
| 13   | 94                         | 39.3               | 177                          | 32.7               | +                |
| 14   | 92                         | 29.3               | 163                          | 18.4               | +                |
| 15   | 92                         | 31.5               | 172                          | 29.6               | +                |
| 16   | 89                         | 16.9               | 172                          | 17.9               | -                |
| 17   | 94                         | 20.2               | 176                          | 25.8               | -                |
| 18   | 95                         | 20.0               | 177                          | 14.7               | +                |
| 19   | 98                         | 38.8               | 176                          | 47.7               | -                |
| 20   | 95                         | 25.2               | 169                          | 20.7               | +                |
| 21   | 96                         | 21.9               | 184                          | 21.7               | +                |
| 22   | 94                         | 31.9               | 170                          | 40.6               | -                |
| 23   | 93                         | 20.4               | 161                          | 33.5               | -                |
| 24   | 98                         | 38.7               | 177                          | 29.9               | +                |
| 25   | 93                         | 42.0               | 171                          | 32.8               | +                |
| 26   | 96                         | 38.6               | 175                          | 31.2               | +                |
| 27   | 93                         | 43.0               | 164                          | 26.2               | +                |
| 28   | 92                         | 32.6               | 157                          | 23.0               | +                |
| 29   | 90                         | 35.6               | 161                          | 22.4               | +                |
| 30   | 92                         | 21.8               | 152                          | 17.7               | +                |
| 31   | 92                         | 41.3               | 164                          | 25.0               | +                |
| 32   | 90                         | 18.9               | 156                          | 18.6               | +                |
| 33   | 85                         | 29.4               | 152                          | 17.1               | +                |
| 34   | 92                         | 20.6               | 162                          | 18.5               | +                |
| 35   | 91                         | 29.7               | 157                          | 23.6               | +                |
| 36   | 93                         | 27.0               | 153                          | 25.5               | +                |
| 37   | 84                         | 28.6               | 165                          | 16.9               | +                |
| 38   | 94                         | 24.2               | 168                          | 20.2               | +                |
| 39   | 97                         | 29.9               | 161                          | 20.5               | +                |
| 40   | 96                         | 27.1               | 170                          | 19.4               | +                |



TABLE XVIII (Continued)

| Item                        | A-Outsiders--No Experience |                    | B-Outsiders--Some Experience |                    | Sign of<br>A - B |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
|                             | N                          | Per Cent<br>Change | N                            | Per Cent<br>Change |                  |
| 41                          | 86                         | 16.3               | 168                          | 26.8               | -                |
| 42                          | 92                         | 21.7               | 169                          | 24.8               | -                |
| 43                          | 90                         | 20.0               | 168                          | 17.5               | +                |
| 44                          | 95                         | 23.2               | 175                          | 9.2                | +                |
| 45                          | 95                         | 19.0               | 183                          | 15.3               | +                |
| 46                          | 95                         | 26.4               | 165                          | 18.2               | +                |
| 47                          | 94                         | 26.6               | 173                          | 12.7               | +                |
| 48                          | 95                         | 30.5               | 175                          | 26.2               | +                |
| 49                          | 98                         | 20.4               | 174                          | 9.8                | +                |
| 50                          | 97                         | 22.7               | 175                          | 8.0                | +                |
| 51                          | 98                         | 37.7               | 167                          | 29.3               | +                |
| 52                          | 96                         | 26.1               | 167                          | 26.3               | -                |
| 53                          | 97                         | 25.8               | 171                          | 21.6               | +                |
| 54                          | 97                         | 35.0               | 172                          | 30.8               | +                |
| 55                          | 92                         | 34.7               | 170                          | 28.8               | +                |
| 56                          | 97                         | 31.9               | 177                          | 28.8               | +                |
| 57                          | 97                         | 25.8               | 175                          | 20.0               | +                |
| 58                          | 93                         | 26.9               | 176                          | 13.1               | +                |
| 59                          | 95                         | 19.0               | 175                          | 10.4               | +                |
| 60                          | 88                         | 37.4               | 157                          | 32.5               | +                |
| 61                          | 95                         | 24.2               | 179                          | 20.1               | +                |
| 62                          | 94                         | 42.6               | 168                          | 32.1               | +                |
| 63                          | 87                         | 11.5               | 163                          | 22.7               | -                |
| 64                          | 92                         | 22.8               | 171                          | 26.9               | -                |
| 65                          | 85                         | 8.3                | 165                          | 15.7               | -                |
| 66                          | 87                         | 14.9               | 171                          | 17.5               | -                |
| 67                          | 94                         | 28.7               | 174                          | 21.3               | +                |
| 68                          | 88                         | 34.2               | 170                          | 27.0               | +                |
| 69                          | 89                         | 40.4               | 171                          | 32.1               | +                |
| 70                          | 93                         | 10.6               | 165                          | 8.5                | +                |
| 71                          | 92                         | 41.3               | 161                          | 24.8               | +                |
| Total number of minus signs |                            |                    |                              |                    | 15               |





## APPENDIX B

### THE QUESTIONNAIRE



377 - Capri Avenue.,  
Calgary, Alberta

PRINCIPAL SUCCESSION AND ITS EFFECT UPON ORGANIZATIONAL  
CHANGE WITHIN THE SCHOOL

To the Principal:

The six questionnaires enclosed in this packet have been designed to elicit some information from teachers about various features of the organization of your school which may have changed since your inception as its principal. The questionnaire has been compiled to collect data for a research study which I am conducting in the Division of Educational Administration. My advisor is John H. M. Andrews.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what types of organizational change new principals initiate within a school. A second purpose is to determine whether this change or lack of change on various features of the organization of the school is desirable or undesirable from a teacher's viewpoint. Since the teachers' responses will be entirely dichotomous -- that is, either yes or no -- the data from the questionnaire will not reveal the direction of change.

The change could be an addition or subtraction, a small modification or a complete conversion of some particular feature of the organization. Although the teachers' responses will indicate some preference for specific changes or lack of changes, their responses will not have any value connotation in the study, that is, change or lack of change, or even the desirability or undesirability of change is not inherently good or bad.

Nevertheless, this data is somewhat confidential. By having you distribute the questionnaires, the teachers' responses will be kept entirely anonymous. Furthermore, all the returned information will be held in complete



confidence. Information pertaining to individual teachers, principals, schools or school systems will not be revealed in the study.

Because there are very few schools in Alberta that have had new principals since 1962, returns from every school selected are very essential. I earnestly solicit your permission in allowing the teachers to complete the questionnaire and your co-operation in distributing the questionnaires. It would be greatly appreciated if you could return these questionnaires within two weeks of their receipt. Below are the suggested directions for distributing and collecting the questionnaires so as to ensure that the teachers' responses are anonymous.

#### SUGGESTED DIRECTIONS

1. Please give the six questionnaires to any six teachers who have been on the staff for the two consecutive school terms. If there are fewer than six teachers who qualify, then give it to as many teachers as possible who have been in the school for two consecutive years.

2. Designate a teacher who is not completing a questionnaire as the person responsible for collecting the questionnaires as they are completed. Please give the stamped, self-addressed return packet to him (or her) with the instructions that he (or she) is to collect all the teachers questionnaires and the principal's information sheet. It is his (or her) responsibility to mail the return packet to me. Please ask him (or her) to staple, not seal, the return packet.

3. Please fill out the Principal's Information Sheet which applies to yourself, seal it in the small envelope entitled Principal's Information,





and deliver it to the designated teacher, who will enclose it with all the completed questionnaires in the stamped, self-addressed return packet.

4. Please encourage the teachers to answer the questionnaire without any consultation with you or any other teachers. Explain that their responses will be kept anonymous and confidential. It is not necessary that the teachers fill out the questionnaire at any certain time although you and they might find it more convenient and expedient to set aside a part of the noon-hour, recess, or staff-meeting to answer the questionnaire. This procedure I leave to your discretion.

5. When giving the questionnaire to the teachers, you might explain its general purpose. The directions, however, for completion of the questionnaire should be self-explanatory. No names are needed on the questionnaire or the principal's information sheet for quite obvious reasons.

Thank you very much for your co-operation. Express my sincere thanks to the teachers who will be completing the questionnaires.

---



## QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check all the following items on which your new principal instituted some important change from the practices or conditions that existed in the school prior to his term of office. Any addition, substitution, deletion or modification of former practices or conditions is considered to be a change. Also check your opinion on the desirability of changes made or not made.

### DIRECTIONS:

1. READ each item carefully.
2. Think of the practices or situation that occurred in your school under the former principal. Then think of the present practices or situation under your new principal.
3. DECIDE whether an important change has occurred. UNDER column I place a check (✓) under the word YES if an important change has occurred. Place a check (✓) under NO if it has not. Note: An important change is one which was distinctly noticeable from your point of view and which has some significant effect on the administration of the school and, thus, an effect on the behaviour of teachers and students.
4. If you have placed a check under YES in column I PROCEED to column II. Decide whether this important change was desirable from your point of view. Check YES if it was; NO if it was not.
5. If you have placed a check under NO in column I PROCEED to column III. Decide whether a lack of change was desirable from your point of view. If it was, check YES. If the existing, unchanged practices or conditions were not satisfactory or desirable and you possibly saw a need for some important change check NO.





6. Please check all items. Notice that each item will have ONLY TWO checks, one under column I and one under EITHER column II or III. Please DO NOT check both columns II and III in any one item.

SECTION I: FEATURES OF THE  
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION THAT  
RELATE TO STAFF PERSONNEL  
Staff Meetings

Was there an  
important  
change  
Yes No

Was this  
change  
desirable  
Yes No

Was this  
lack of change  
desirable  
Yes No

1. The frequency of staff meetings.

2. Number of routine administrative announcements given at most staff meetings.

3. Nature or extent of formal staff discussion about the diagnosis, improvement or evaluation of the instructional program in the school.

4. The nature or extent of teacher participation in most staff meetings.

Staff Consultation and Supervision

5. Function of the principal in observing or evaluating teachers through the use of formal classroom visits.

6. Relationship between the teacher and the principal during the formal classroom visit.

7. Number of unexpected informal classroom visits made by the principal.

8. Frequency with which the principal supervises the school halls, playgrounds or gymnasium during school hours.

9. Method or frequency with which the principal checks the attendance OR behavior of teachers who are supervising students in the halls or playgrounds during recess, noon-hour, or before school opening.





|                                                                                                                                                                          | Was there an<br>important<br>change |    |  | Was this<br>change<br>desirable |    |  | Was this<br>lack of change<br>desirable |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|--|---------------------------------|----|--|-----------------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                          | Yes                                 | No |  | Yes                             | No |  | Yes                                     | No |
| 10. Method or frequency with which the principal checks teachers who are absent from or late for school OR absent from or late for particular classes during the day.    |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 11. Number or kind of written or verbal regulations that teachers are expected to follow.                                                                                |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 12. Number or kind of written or verbal regulations <u>actually</u> adhered to by teachers.                                                                              |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 13. Function of the principal in providing individual consultation for teachers who have teaching problems.                                                              |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 14. Nature or extent of group consultation activities in the school (e.g. action research, in-service education programs, group observation of demonstration teaching).  |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 15. Number or kind of differentiated or modified programs planned or developed by the staff to meet the unique needs of this school.                                     |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 16. Method of orienting new teachers to the school (e.g. pre-school orientation meetings, school handbooks, meet the teacher night, intern teaching, social gatherings). |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 17. Function of the principal in assisting teachers with parent conferences.                                                                                             |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 18. Nature or extent of a general school policy regarding the use of class time for having class parties, candy sales, rummage sales, etc.                               |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |



SECTION 2: FEATURES OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION THAT RELATE TO PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

|                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Was there an important change |    | Was this change desirable |    | Was this lack of change desirable |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----|---------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Yes                           | No | Yes                       | No | Yes                               | No |
| 19. General school routine associated with the entry, exit or movement of pupils at recesses, school opening, or school closing.                                                                     |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 20. Function of the teacher in supervising pupils at recess, noon hour, or before school opening in the morning or afternoon.                                                                        |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 21. Method of selecting or scheduling teachers for the supervision of halls or playgrounds at noon-hour, recess, or before school opening.                                                           |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 22. Function of the principal in administering corporal punishment.                                                                                                                                  |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 23. Function of the teacher in delegating difficult discipline problems to the principal, vice-principal or (a) guidance counsellor(s).                                                              |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 24. Nature or number of formal regulations that students are expected to follow.                                                                                                                     |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 25. Nature or number of regulations <u>actually</u> followed by students.                                                                                                                            |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 26. Nature or extent of teacher participation in discussing or developing a general school policy on discipline.                                                                                     |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| <u>Extra-Curricular Activities</u>                                                                                                                                                                   |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |
| 27. Nature or extent of organized sports activities or student activities within the school (e.g. houseleague basketball, clubs, dances, rallies, graduation exercises, volley ball, ping-pong, etc. |                               |    |                           |    |                                   |    |





|                                                                                                                                | Was there an<br>important<br>change |    | Was this<br>change<br>desirable |    | Was this<br>lack of change<br>desirable |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                | Yes                                 | No | Yes                             | No | Yes                                     | No |
| 28. Nature or extent of student government activities.                                                                         |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 29. Method of organizing or controlling all extra-curricular activities in the school.                                         |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 30. Nature or extent of inter-school athletics competition.                                                                    |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 31. Function of the principal in regard to directing, scheduling or controlling extra-curricular activities.                   |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 32. Nature or extent of teacher participation in developing school-wide policies related to extra-curricular activities.       |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| <u>Homework and Guidance</u>                                                                                                   |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 33. Function of guidance counselor(s) in the guidance program of the school.                                                   |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 34. Nature or extent of a school policy regarding the amount or type of homework expected of students at various grade levels. |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 35. Nature or extent of a school policy for enforcing students to complete homework assignments.                               |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 36. Method of informing parents about school policies related to homework.                                                     |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| <u>Organization and Promotion of Pupils</u>                                                                                    |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 37. General school policy regarding the promotion or non-promotion of students.                                                |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 38. Function of the principal in advising or deciding on specific pupil promotions or non-promotions.                          |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |





|                                                                                                                                                                                            | Was there an<br>important<br>change |    | Was this<br>change<br>desirable |    | Was this<br>lack of change<br>desirable |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                                            | Yes                                 | No | Yes                             | No | Yes                                     | No |
| 39. Nature or extent of teacher participation in discussing or developing a general school policy on pupil promotions.                                                                     |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 40. Extent to which the school communicates with parents about students who may be special promotion or non-promotion cases. (e.g. students who might need to be retarded or accelerated.) |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 41. Method of classifying or grouping students into classrooms for instruction at various grade levels (e.g. homogeneous grouping).                                                        |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 42. Function of the principal in classifying, grouping, or placing pupils into various classrooms.                                                                                         |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 43. Nature or extent to which special classes or remedial instruction are provided for the bright or dull student.                                                                         |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| <u>Pupil Accounting</u>                                                                                                                                                                    |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 44. Function of standardized tests used in the school (e.g. intelligence, achievement, aptitude, diagnostic.)                                                                              |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 45. Function of the teacher in administering, recording, or analyzing standardized tests.                                                                                                  |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 46. Function of the principal in recording or checking pupil achievement in each class.                                                                                                    |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 47. Methods or symbols used to record pupil achievement on reports of pupil progress sent to parents.                                                                                      |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |



|                                                                                                                                                                    | Was there an<br>important<br>change |    |  | Was this<br>change<br>desirable |    |  | Was this<br>lack of change<br>desirable |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|--|---------------------------------|----|--|-----------------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                    | Yes                                 | No |  | Yes                             | No |  | Yes                                     | No |
| 48. Function of the principal in checking report cards sent out by teachers or returned by parents.                                                                |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 49. Function of cumulative record cards in the school.                                                                                                             |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 50. Function of the teacher in entering, checking or filing cumulative record cards.                                                                               |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 51. Function of the principal in checking pupil lates, absences or transfers.                                                                                      |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 52. General method of recording, collecting, or checking teacher's reports, school attendance registers, or pupil achievement forms at the end of the school year. |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| SECTION 3: FEATURES OF THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION THAT RELATE TO THE MANAGEMENT OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND ROUTINE ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES                          |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 53. Methods developed for accomodating pupils who stay for lunch.                                                                                                  |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 54. Nature or extent of library services offered by the school.                                                                                                    |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 55. Method of selecting or requisitioning for school supplies, equipment or textbooks.                                                                             |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 56. Method of distributing school supplies, equipment or textbooks to teachers or pupils.                                                                          |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 57. Function of the teacher in selecting, requisitioning, distributing, supervising or accounting for school supplies, equipment or textbooks.                     |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |





|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Was there an<br>important<br>change |    | Was this<br>change<br>desirable |    | Was this<br>lack of change<br>desirable |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Yes                                 | No | Yes                             | No | Yes                                     | No |
| 58. Function of the principal in managing or supervising the school plant or in supervising the teacher's responsibility for maintaining a neat or tidy classroom (e.g. checking cupboards, rooms, and halls, for neatness and cleanliness; checking lighting and ventilation in the school). |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 59. Time that school classes begin or end in the morning or afternoon.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 60. Number or nature of administrative responsibilities assigned to the vice-principal.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 61. Method of informing parents about school activities or procedures.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 62. Method of informing teachers or students of minor administrative changes each day.                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 63. Nature or extent of relationships between the school staff and members of the Home and School Association.                                                                                                                                                                                |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| SECTION 4: FEATURES OF THE INFORMAL ORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 64. The particular teachers within the school with whom the new principal consults most frequently about administrative problems in the school.                                                                                                                                               |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 65. The particular teachers to whom the new principal <u>seems</u> to grant certain privileges or favors that he does not extend to all teachers.                                                                                                                                             |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |
| 66. The particular teachers who tend to dominate discussions at staff meetings.                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                     |    |                                 |    |                                         |    |





|                                                                                                                                                                     | Was there an<br>important<br>change |    |  | Was this<br>change<br>desirable |    |  | Was this<br>lack of change<br>desirable |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|--|---------------------------------|----|--|-----------------------------------------|----|
|                                                                                                                                                                     | Yes                                 | No |  | Yes                             | No |  | Yes                                     | No |
| 67. The extent to which informal groups of teachers gather in the staff room at recess, noon-hour, or before or after school opening and the nature of such groups. |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 68. The composition of the informal groups of teachers with which the principal frequently associates as a participating member.                                    |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 69. The frequency with which the principal talks informally to teachers about personal events or things such as their hobbies or children.                          |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 70. The frequency with which teachers meet in informal groups (of two or more teachers) during official class time (e.g. at the water cooler in the hall).          |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |
| 71. The frequency with which the principal visits the staff room at noon-hour, recess, or before or after school opening.                                           |                                     |    |  |                                 |    |  |                                         |    |

#### SECTION 5: THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE

Underline the description which best describes the extent and nature of change in your school:

72. In my opinion, there was (very little, some change, much change), in the organization of the school.

73. In my opinion this amount of change OR no change was (very desirable, somewhat desirable, somewhat undesirable, very undesirable).



## TEACHER'S INFORMATION SHEET

The following information is required to test the representative nature of the teachers who are responding to the questionnaire. This information will not be used to identify respondents. Please answer all questions.

1. Including the present year, the total number of years you have been in this school is \_\_\_1-2, \_\_\_3-4, \_\_\_5-6, \_\_\_7-8, \_\_\_9-10, \_\_\_11 or more.
2. Your age is \_\_\_18-25, \_\_\_26-30, \_\_\_31-35, \_\_\_36-45, \_\_\_46-55, \_\_\_56 or more.
3. Your total number of years of university training is \_\_\_1, \_\_\_2, \_\_\_3, \_\_\_4, \_\_\_5, \_\_\_6 or more.
4. Including the present year your total number of years of teaching experience is \_\_\_1-2, \_\_\_3-4, \_\_\_5-6, \_\_\_7-8, \_\_\_9-10, \_\_\_11-13, \_\_\_14-17, \_\_\_18 or more.





## PRINCIPAL'S INFORMATION SHEET

The following information is required to test the representative nature of the sample of principles who are included in this study. This information will be kept strictly confidential. Individual principals, schools, or school systems will not be identified in the study. Please answer all questions.

1. Either as an administrator or a teacher the number of years you have been in this school (including the present year) is \_\_1, \_\_2, \_\_3, \_\_4-5, \_\_6-7, \_\_8-10, \_\_11 or more.
2. Your age is \_\_18-25, \_\_26-30, \_\_31-35, \_\_36-45, \_\_46-55, \_\_56 or more.
3. Including the present year, your total number of years as principal, vice-principal, or department head in various schools is \_\_0-2, \_\_3-4, \_\_5-6, \_\_7-8, \_\_9 or more.
4. The total number of years in which you have been a teacher but NOT an administrator (principal, vice-principal or department head) is \_\_0-2, \_\_4-7, \_\_8-11, \_\_12-15, \_\_16-19, \_\_20 or more years.
5. Including the present year, either as an administrator or a teacher the total number of years you have been in the present school system is \_\_1, \_\_2, \_\_3-4, \_\_5-7, \_\_8-10, \_\_11 or more.
6. Your total number of years of university training is \_\_0-2, \_\_3, \_\_4, \_\_5, \_\_6, \_\_7 or more.
7. Please circle the highest grade taught in this school: 1 2 3 4 5  
6 7 8 9 10 11 12.
8. Please circle the total number of teachers in this school: 5 6 7 8  
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 or more.





377 Capri Avenue  
Calgary, Alberta.

To the Principal:

If a member of your staff has already returned the packet of completed questionnaires you have my sincere appreciation for the assistance given me by you and your colleagues.

If, however, you have not yet returned the questionnaires perhaps this follow-up letter might serve as a small reminder. To date, more than half of the questionnaires have been received. Because of the small sample of schools selected it is desirable that a high percentage of questionnaires be returned. At present there is not quite enough data for completion of the study.

If you and your staff are willing to complete the questionnaires perhaps the post-Christmas period might allow more time. I would sincerely appreciate any efforts made by you or your staff. Thank you for your consideration of this letter and thank you, also, for any assistance you have rendered or will render.

Perhaps you could also re-address the packet as follows:

Mr. Lawrence E. Rappel  
377 Capri Avenue  
Calgary, Alberta.

Yours truly,

Lawrence E. Rappel

LAR:MR





**B29838**